

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 10633) granting an increase of pension to Durbin Longfellow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10634) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 10635) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10636) granting a pension to John Kerns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10637) granting an increase of pension to Johnson Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10638) granting a pension to Levi C. Posey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10639) granting an honorable discharge to John D. Gardner, alias John Darity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 10640) granting an increase of pension to William H. Spang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 10641) granting an increase of pension to Phineas P. Ewan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10642) granting a pension to Luther Bedel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10643) granting an increase of pension to Allen Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10644) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Lynch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10645) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 10646) for the relief of Charles Haythorpe; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10647) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10648) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Heald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 10649) granting a pension to Eva Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 10650) granting an increase of pension to Robert Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 10651) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 10652) granting an increase of pension to James K. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10653) granting an increase of pension to James L. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10654) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 10655) granting a pension to Rosalie Thomas Draper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10656) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 10657) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Women's Municipal League, of Boston, favoring House bill 9642, appropriating \$50,000,000 for the housing of war workers; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), petitions of 24 members of the Bucklick Farm Club, New Haven; 26 members of the Rock Hill Farm Club, Krakow; 22 members of the Grand Farm Club, New Haven; and memorials of the Good Hope Farmers' Club, Gerald; Evergreen Farm Club, of school district No. 57, Franklin County, and the Union Community Farm Club, Atlanta, all in the State of Missouri, protesting against the discrimination against the farmers in price schedules and asking that farmers be allowed such prices as will pay cost of production and a small profit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), resolution of the Visiting Nurse Association, Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging that military rank be conferred upon members of the nursing corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the Irish Progressive League of Boston, urging recognition of Ireland as an independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of J. H. Bloom, editor of Devils Lake Journal, Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring the zone system for second-class postage, and recommending the increase of such rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a resolution of the Pierian Club, Trinidad, Colo., protesting against this system and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: Evidence in support of a bill to pension Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of Louis Lowinson, New York City; Dunn & McCarty, Auburn, N. Y.; and Rose Bros., New York City, urging the passage of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of R. B. Williams and 11 other citizens, H. H. Evisizer and 9 other citizens, of Butler, Mo., for the closing of all saloons and breweries for the period of the war, to save food, fuel, and man power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of Irish Woman's Council, favoring an Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Dr. Clifford E. Smith and 24 other physicians of Dekalb County, Ill., asking that physicians in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army be given the same rank and percentage as in the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago Woman's Club, opposing the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. W. Potter and 12 other citizens of Rockford, Ill., favoring the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Mount Pleasant Citizens' Association, approving Government operation of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution of the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, Cal., in re Walter V. Wohelke, a German, who has attacked organized labor through the columns of Sunset Magazine; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letter of C. A. Hawkins, of San Francisco, Cal., in re war cabinet; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Montrose, Colo., urging the enactment of war-prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the Hanover United Presbyterian Church, Beaver County, Pa., for national prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, asking for the passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1918.

(Legislative day of Friday, March 8, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian.

ALBERT B. FALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in his seat to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Baird	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Beckham	Hollis	Nugent	Sterling
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poinexter	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Thompson
Dillingham	Kellogg	Reed	Townsend
Fletcher	Kenyon	Robinson	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Saulsbury	Underwood
Gallinger	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh
Hale	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Harding	McNary	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Hardwick	Martin	Smith, Mich.	Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. SAULSBURY). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. Wolcott] is detained at home by illness.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GORFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

COAL OUTPUT IN COLORADO.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, last Friday I took occasion to insert in the RECORD an order of the Fuel Commission materially reducing the prices of coal to operators in the four States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah. I then ventured a prediction that the order which by its own terms went into effect on the 11th day of March would result in a material restriction of the coal output in my State. My forecast was verified much earlier than I expected. I have received a telegram from one of the operators, dated March 9, informing me that in consequence of the promulgation of the order 27 mines had at once closed, while coal in transit to dealers would not be settled for until April, the consignees desiring to take advantage of the increased reduction for that month.

I at once wired for the names of the mines which had suspended. I was unable to get them all, but this morning I received a telegram listing 20 of them, whose daily output is 7,180 tons. They employ 1,593 men, who are now idle. In addition to this situation, 7 of the larger mines have begun to dump their slack, which is no longer marketable at the prices fixed by the commission.

These, Mr. President, I shall submit to the Senate without comment as the first and immediate fruit of an order which should never have been made. I am unable to account for this extreme and radical reduction in prices which, in effect, ignores the requirements of the statute that a reasonable profit shall be allowed, unless it be that the commissioner, having confined his suspension order of last January to the territory east of the Mississippi, has recently satisfied himself that equity and justice required him to make another order which would similarly affect all the country west of the Mississippi, thus imposing his orders, like the rain from heaven, alike upon the heads of the just and the unjust.

Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD, without reading, the two telegrams to which I have just called attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. I should like to have the telegrams read.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object. I did not read them myself, because I did not want to take up any further time of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat? I think it perfectly apparent, and should be so, that the price of slack which the Senator has just stated places it beyond the reach of any consumption, and therefore it is wasted.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; the dumping of the slack disposes of it; it is no longer available for commercial purposes. I might say a great deal regarding this order, but will refrain, lest in my exasperation I say something that I should afterwards regret.

Mr. REED. I should like to have the telegrams read for the information of the Senate as well as for my own information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegrams were read, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., March 9, 1918.

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

The last announcement by Fuel Administration of large reduction in Colorado coal prices effective March 11 and still larger reduction effective April 1 is a great shock to the coal industry of this State, and in my opinion is entirely unwarranted and unjust. Because of this reduction about 27 mines are closed to-day and coal in transit to dealers from northern Nebraska to central Texas is being refused by them, they demanding the April price. This is a condition that we tried to impress on the Fuel Administration would prevail if they made any announcement of prices prior to April 1, so that Colorado bituminous operators are in the position of not only losing money on coal that they mine from and after March 11, but on the coal they have mined during the last three weeks. I will wire you Monday the names of the mines that are down, also those that have been forced to dump slack. It is a safe estimate that the output to Colorado for 1918 will be curtailed because the prices set by the Fuel Administration are not remunerative. Most of the mines will lose less money by shutting down than by continuing operation under these unjust prices. The wage scale for the Trinidad district is less than the wage scale for the Walsenburg and Canon City districts, yet the Fuel Administration allows them 10 cents more per ton for mine-run coal. Many other inequalities exist in their recent decision, showing plainly that they have not used facts as basis for their order. Hundreds of miners in

this State are not earning a penny this day on account of this order, and these men would have been working had the Fuel Administration left our prices alone and the Nation would have had the increased production in place of the loss to men of wages and to the country of coal. Colorado operators have never been confronted with a more serious condition than exists now, and the condition will rapidly become worse if this price order is not immediately withdrawn and remunerative prices permitted. Our miners will scatter to the four winds and the people dependent on Colorado for coal will suffer. Operators think that prices in effect March 1 should be continued and that no lower storage prices be made than those mentioned in our briefs, copy of which you have, and that an order to this effect should be issued immediately to save the situation. Please wire me your views.

HARRY F. NASH.

DENVER, COLO., March 11, 1918.

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS,

Washington, D. C.:

There is a heavy windstorm on to-day in southern Colorado, putting out of commission telephone and telegraph lines, so am not able to give you full reports of mines down to-day. Those I know of as not working to-day are Hecla, Acme, Nonpareil, Centennial, Sunnyside, Monarch, Two, Corham, Industrial, Matchless, Fox, Russell, McNeil, Wolfree, Laramore, Turner, Royal Gorge, Emerald King, Anthracite, Buckley. Total lost tonnage for day of these mines, 7,180. Total men out of employment at these mines, 1,593. Am satisfied that easily 2,000 men are out of employment at mines to-day and loss of 10,000 tons. The following mines are dumping slack: Big Four, Black Canyon, Aztec, McGregor, Cadell, Strong, Monument, Valley. Operators are thoroughly disheartened.

HARRY F. NASH.

NATIONAL ARMY DRAFT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I received a statement this morning from the War Department with reference to its policy as to the coming draft. I presume that every Senator received a copy of it through the mail. I think it is a matter that ought to be given as much publicity as possible. I have no doubt but that the War Department has given it to the newspapers. It discloses the course that the department is going to take in the new draft in order to disturb as little as possible the industries of the country, and especially to take care of the agricultural situation. In order to assist in the publicity of it, however, I think it would be well to have it printed in the RECORD, and I ask that this may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEXT DRAFT.

There has been a great deal of speculation in the press concerning what has been termed "the date of the next draft." Almost every week announcements have been made, and these announcements, being mere guesses, have resulted in an unrest and uncertainty that has been unfortunate.

As a matter of fact, the state of preparedness of the Army to assimilate recruits varies from day to day and from week to week, and the most scientific manner of recruiting the forces will be to withdraw them from civil life as fast as they can be assimilated by the Army and no faster. According to this plan, men will be inducted into the service in very small groups, apportioned among the various States, from week to week or from month to month as they are needed. In order to distribute the burden equally over the various States, however, it is necessary to make arithmetical computations of the share of each State, and it is not practicable to make these computations for such small numbers. For mere bookkeeping facility, therefore, it is necessary to assume a total of considerable size and to apportion it among the several States as their immediate burden. This total is called a national quota and the various shares are called State quotas. The announcement of the quota does not mean that any such great number of men will be called to military service at once and, indeed, has no necessary relation to the date of call for the reason that a constantly changing situation causes changes in the number of men who are to be called to the colors.

It is unwise to attempt to make a forecast of the number of men that will be called for immediate military service in advance of the development of the whole complex problem of supply and transportation. It is also unwise to make public announcements of specific figures which might serve the enemy as a precise basis for determining the plans for military participation of the Nation in this war. It is necessary, however, to compose the present unrest and uncertainty by some public announcement, and for this reason the following is authoritatively stated:

The next national quota will be announced and apportioned among the several States as soon as pending legislation authorizing a change in the basis of computation is enacted by Congress. This legislation has been passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the House Military Committee. The number that will be assumed as a basis for computation will be 800,000, which is well within the authorization of clause 4 of section 1 of the selective-service act of a second increment of 500,000 men, increased by the recruit training units authorized by clause 5 of said section 1, and by the special and technical troops authorized by section 2 of said act. It can not now be announced what the total number to be called to the colors each month will be, but it may be stated that no more men will be called than can be properly accommodated and promptly assimilated.

There are difficulties confronting the Nation in the supply of labor appurtenant to agriculture. Class I, from which new levies are to be withdrawn, will contain many more men than are at present required for the Army. It would be a most unscientific and fatuous step if the men in Class I were called indiscriminately without regard to the labor situation in agriculture. Therefore the local boards will be directed to fill their quotas in the order of liability of men in Class I as determined by the national drawing, except that where it is shown that a registrant is completely and assiduously engaged in the planting, cultivation, or reaping of a crop his call to the colors shall be deferred to the foot of the quota of his board as long as he continues to be so engaged. Whenever any registrant whose call to the colors has been deferred by reason of his engagement in agriculture is shown to have been idle on the farm on which he is engaged or to have

trified with the deferment that has been accorded him, the boards will forthwith induct him into military service if his order number has been reached in the meantime. The effect of this expedient is to grant furloughs from service prior to actual call to the colors to the men so greatly needed in the production of this year's crop.

This is not, however, the only expedient that is to be adopted to conserve the supply of labor appurtenant to agriculture and to mobilize all means for increasing the harvest for the agricultural season of 1918. There is now pending before Congress a bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant furloughs, with or without pay, to men in the Army to enable them to engage in industrial and agricultural pursuits. The purpose of this bill is to relieve serious situations in particular instances in which men who are the mainstay of farms have been inducted into the service, either through voluntary enlistment or selection, and whose services during the present emergency in agriculture are needed. These furloughs will be granted after consideration of the circumstances of the individual case in which they arise, and when the military situation is such that they can be granted without too great disruption and disorganization of the Army or of any particular organization of the Army.

As to further means to protect agriculture, a new regulation has been promulgated authorizing agricultural students in their senior year in land-grant colleges to enlist in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Quartermaster Department, provided their class standing is such as to place them in the upper third of their class. By this means it will be possible to defer the draft call of such young men in order to enable them to perfect themselves as agriculturalists, and thereafter to protect them in such services as it may seem that they should perform in the best interests of the Nation.

The whole industrial and agricultural situation is being subjected to a very comprehensive study in order to discover any means that may be taken to protect and augment the labor supply appurtenant to industry and agriculture without precluding the prompt and orderly progress of our military plans. It is confidently believed that great progress can be made along this line, and that more effective measures than any yet devised can be put into operation to attain the desired end.

It must be emphasized that this is a war of mechanics. The need of the several armed forces for men highly skilled in technical and mechanical pursuits is greater than in any former war. Yet this need for specially skilled men finds the Nation under a necessity for increasing its production in almost every line of industry. Withdrawals of men from industry must be made, and these withdrawals must take men who might otherwise be deferred on account of their special qualifications and skill. The necessary numbers of such skilled men will be obtained in one of three ways: First, men already in the military service who have such special skill will be taken from the line regiments and assigned to the staff organizations and departments where their skill is needed. Second, men classified by the selection boards, even though they may have been placed in a deferred classification, will be withdrawn with great care and particularity from the industries of the Nation for special service in staff corps and departments. Third, young men of draft age with certain educational qualifications will be inducted into the service and sent to universities, colleges, and technical and secondary schools to be instructed in technical arts until they have acquired such proficiency as will justify their assignment to the special units that are being organized in considerable numbers.

In accordance with this plan, the Provost Marshal General has already called upon the States for some 10,000 skilled artisans, and will shortly call upon the States for 10,000 young men, graduates of grammar school, who will be sent before the 1st of April to various technical and other schools throughout the United States for a two months' course of training. Regularly thereafter an increasing stream of selected men will be sent through educational and other training institutions for this purpose.

To sum up, it may be said that there will be no sudden withdrawal of great numbers of men from the ranks of industry and agriculture during the coming summer, but that men will be drawn in relatively small groups throughout the year in such a way as to create the least possible interference with industry and agriculture. Men in deferred classes as well as men in Class I will be selected in small numbers, either on account of their special technical qualifications or for the purpose of sending them to schools where they will be given an opportunity to acquire such qualifications.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the sum of \$11,295,000 required for terminal storage and shipping buildings, Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., and manufacture of arms, Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill. (S. Doc. No. 198), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation of \$30,000 for fuel, light, and water, Public Health Service (S. Doc. No. 199), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of War submitting additional estimates of appropriations required by the Ordnance Department to complete the service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, armament of fortifications, \$375,074,465, and proving-ground facilities, \$6,300,000 (S. Doc. No. 200), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon

certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life and public services of Hon. HENRY T. HELGESEN, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the United Congregations of the Congregational and Methodist Churches of Lancaster, N. H., praying for the conservation of food and fuel by the closing of all breweries and for prohibitory regulations in France, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the Manatee Medical Society, of Manatee County, Fla., praying for an advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cadillac and Ironwood and of W. H. Barnum, of Fremont, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Business Woman's Club of Detroit, Mich., praying for a repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of River Junction; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cadillac; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Adrian; of the Men's Brotherhood of the First Baptist Church of Flint; of the congregation of the Lakeview Methodist Church, of Flint; and of the congregation of the North Baptist Church, of Flint, all in the State of Michigan, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Business Woman's Club of Detroit, Mich., praying for the admission into the medical branch of the Navy of osteopathic physicians and providing for their official status, rank, and pay, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a telegram from the editor of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., which I ask may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., March 11, 1918.

KENNETH D. McKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

This ruling of the War Department about not giving out the home address of killed soldiers is an outrage and is breaking the hearts of a lot of fathers and mothers in Memphis. At this hour we have already checked up six boys killed who were members of an ambulance company. It was the first company that went abroad from Memphis. Some received their telegrams early, others later. We are printing the story in paper to-morrow morning of seven Memphians killed. We get our data from roster of company and from weeping parents. Other parents uncertain as to fate of their own in the same company. The people are already as if 10,000 miles away from the war, except when death enters their homes. There is nothing that will so deaden the interest in the war as to suppress the identity of those killed and wounded. It takes all the newspapers can do to arouse the people to the colossal work the Nation must do. I am making no claim as to the rights of newspapers, but I do feel that this course will be hurtful to the cause. Please have Senator New insist on his resolution. All the newspapers want is the names and address and next of kin in the men killed and wounded. We care nothing for the regiment, etc., just the names and address.

C. P. J. MOONEY,
Editor Commercial Appeal.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4074) granting an increase of pension to Adaline D. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4075) granting a pension to Mary S. Kimball (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4076) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 4077) granting an increase of pension to Martha Jane Morrow;

A bill (S. 4078) granting an increase of pension to George S. Richardson; and

A bill (S. 4079) granting an increase of pension to Malinda K. McGowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4080) to incorporate the Woman's Association of Commerce of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) for the appointment of three members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for the standardization and design of sugar-testing apparatus, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 11th instant, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9248. An act to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill on page 4, line 9, and read as follows:

UNITED STATES FOOD AND FUEL ADMINISTRATIONS.

For expenses of the United States Food and Fuel Administrations, created under authority contained in the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, including personal and other services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, traveling expenses, printing and binding, and necessary supplies and equipment, \$1,750,000.

Mr. REED. I understand unanimous consent was given that the bill should be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the order of the Senate.

Mr. REED. To this point the committee amendments have been disposed of, have they not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; but there are quite a large number of committee amendments.

Mr. REED. Then there are committee amendments still to come?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Library of Congress," on page 5, line 3, after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Legislative reference: To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to gather, classify, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress and committees and Members thereof, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

WAR TRADE BOARD.

For the expenses of the War Trade Board, created by the Executive order of October 12, 1917, which Executive order was made under authority of the acts of June 15, 1917, known as the "espionage act," and the act of October 6, 1917, known as the "trading with the enemy act," for traveling expenses of officials and employees while traveling on official business, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 per day; purchase of periodicals and books of reference; purchase, operation, maintenance, fuel, and repairs of motor-propelled vehicles; payment of ground rent and rent of office buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States where branch offices have heretofore been or may hereafter be established; foreign postage and expense of printing and publication of reports, circulars, journals, and other publicity matter; purchase of such material and equipment and employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington or elsewhere as may be necessary to carry on the operations entrusted to the War Trade Board by the President, \$1,018,331.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," subhead "Foreign intercourse," on page 7, after line 12, to insert:

Contingent expenses, foreign missions: For contingent expenses, foreign missions, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917, \$27,856.72.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is not in the Chamber. He called my attention to this amendment, and I will ask the chairman of the committee to let it go over until the Senator returns.

Mr. MARTIN. The amendment may be passed over until the Senator from North Carolina comes in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. MARTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has now come into the Chamber. At the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] the Senate passed over the committee amendment on page 7, line 13, down to and including line 17. That amendment provides for an actual deficiency, and the Senator from North Carolina is now perfectly satisfied that it ought to remain in the bill. I ask that the amendment may be disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 7, after line 17, to insert:

Transportation of diplomatic and consular officers: To pay the actual and necessary expenses of transportation, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of diplomatic and consular officers and clerks in embassies, legations, and consulates in going to and returning from their posts or when traveling under orders of the Secretary of State, but not including any expense incurred in connection with leaves of absence, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to insert:

Relief and protection of American seamen: For relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries, and in the Panama Canal Zone, and shipwrecked American seamen in the Territory of Alaska, in the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to insert:

Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States and to meet the necessary expenses attendant upon the execution of the neutrality act, to be expended pursuant to the requirements of section 291 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That in his discretion the President may employ part of this fund for payment of personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 5, to insert:

Contingent expenses, United States consulates: Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (so much as may be necessary), repairs to consular buildings owned by the United States, postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising, messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agencies in the transaction of their business, and payments in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 10, line 19, after the word "articles," to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

For washing and hemming towels, purchase of awnings and fixtures, window shades and fixtures, alcohol, benzine, turpentine, varnish, baskets, belting, bellows, bowls, brooms, buckets, brushes, canvas, crash, cloth, chamols skins, cotton waste, door and window fasteners, dusters; flower-garden, street, and engine hose; lace leather, lye, nails, oils, plants, picks, pitchers, powders, stencil plates, hand stamps and repairs of same, spittoons, soap, matches, match safes, sponges, tacks, traps, thermometers, toilet paper, tools, towels, towel racks, tumblers, wire, zinc, and for blacksmithing, repairs of machinery, removal of rubbish, sharpening tools, street car tickets not exceeding \$250, advertising for proposals, and for sales at public auction in Washington, D. C., of condemned property belonging to the Treasury Department, payment of auctioneer fees, and purchase of other absolutely necessary articles, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 26, after the word "articles," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$11,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of boxes, book rests, chairs, chair cane, chair covers, desks, bookcases, clocks, cloth for covering desks, cushions, leather for covering chairs and sofas, locks, lumber, screens, tables, typewriters, including the exchange of same, wardrobe cabinets, washstands, water coolers and stands, and for replacing other worn and unserviceable articles, \$11,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public buildings, construction, sites, extensions, and rent," on page 16, after line 14, to insert:

Washington, D. C., Treasury Building Annex: For commencement, within the limit of cost heretofore authorized, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to insert:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Enforcement of the espionage act and the trading with the enemy act. For salaries and expenses for the enforcement of the provisions of the act approved June 15, 1917, known as the "espionage act," and the act approved October 6, 1917, known as the "trading with the enemy act," \$800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 21, after line 17, to insert:

Quarantine Service: For maintenance and ordinary expenses, exclusive of pay of officers and employees, of quarantine stations, including the leprosy hospital and including not exceeding \$500 for printing, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill to the end of line 24, on page 22, the last paragraph being as follows:

IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS.

Repairs to suburban roads: For current work of repairs to suburban roads and suburban streets, including maintenance of motor vehicles, \$20,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in connection with the last item, for the improvement and repair of suburban roads, I desire simply to say that I presume the appropriation is very much needed; but I want to state in the Record, hoping that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia will take cognizance of what I say, that I think the roads in the city of Washington were never in such bad condition as they are at the present time. Very likely the appropriation has been inadequate to permit needed repairs, and, if that be so, I trust the commissioners will see to it that they make recommendations for added appropriations, so that the roads of this city may be put in as good condition as they are in the ordinary country village, which is not the case at the present time.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," subhead "Improvements and repairs," at the top of page 23, to insert:

Highway bridge across Potomac River: For replacing the fenders of the bridge \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to insert:

Paving Park Road: The appropriation of \$17,500 for paving Park Road, New Hampshire Avenue to Fourteenth Street NW., contained in the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1917, approved September 1, 1916, is reappropriated and continued available during the fiscal year 1918.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Schools," on page 25, after line 20, to insert:

Community forums and civic centers: For necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including fixtures and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, janitor service, secretaries, teachers, and organizers and employees of day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, \$15,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I presume it is useless to try to make any saving in the appropriations that we are so lavishly granting at the present time, most of which are urgently needed, I have no doubt. However, there are some matters that we might as well make a little saving on, and this item is one of them. As I understand, this amendment proposes to open the schoolhouses of the District of Columbia for what some good men and women think is a very important purpose, but which does not appeal to me as being at all necessary at the present time. All I will ask is the privilege of having the amendment submitted to the Senate to give me an opportunity to vote against it. If the Senate wants to put it in the bill, I have no fault to find.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am opposed to this amendment and shall cast my vote against it. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate in discussing it; but I think we are embarking upon a dangerous proposition as to which we can not foresee where it is going to lead or where it is going to end. This same subject matter has been before the Senate a number of times in the past, but it has never passed. This is simply the camel getting his nose into the tent; it is a beginning; this is the first appropriation, and there is no telling where it will end.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, there is every evidence as to where it will end; it will end in the District of Columbia, for that is the only place where the Government pretends to exercise jurisdiction over the schools. It will end with such service as is performed here, and if this is an en-

lightening service I do not know why it should not be a part of the appropriation for the maintenance of the schools.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I will occupy only two or three minutes. This amendment commended itself to me in the strongest possible way. We all know that this city is full of young women now working for the Government, who are crowded in hall rooms, garrets, and in other very uncomfortable quarters, with very little, if any, opportunity for recreation or association. This item comes here strongly recommended. I will not take the time to read the letters received favoring this appropriation; but the school authorities, the District Commissioners, the Secretary of War, and others, who are interested in this as a benevolent provision for a very helpless class of Government workers, have recommended it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator tell us who will have charge and direction of the expenditure of the fund? I agree with him that something of the kind ought to be done, and I cordially support the proposed appropriation, hoping that it will be wisely directed.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say that the school authorities will have charge of it. This appropriation of the small sum of \$15,000 is to enable the school authorities to exercise proper supervision over this service.

I was about to read a letter from the Secretary of War, which is an exceedingly strong one, but I am so anxious to save time that I will not read it. I will simply state to the Senate that I have, I am sure, a dozen letters here, including letters from the District Commissioners, the school authorities, the Secretary of War, and others, who are interested in this matter from purely benevolent considerations. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it will be remembered that this matter has been urged in the past before this flood of young women were brought into the District of Columbia. It is, in my opinion, a fad, pure and simple, and nothing else.

It should also be remembered that the States, through the National Government, are paying one-half of the expenses for the school buildings and tuition in the District of Columbia, so that it is not purely a District matter. I have had very grave apprehension that when we open our schoolhouses, which to-day are inadequate for the educational needs of the District, to these gatherings of various kinds much larger appropriations will be demanded of us for repairs and for construction of schoolhouses than are required at the present time. This item does not appeal to me as at all necessary, and while probably it will remain in the bill, because it is a hopeless effort—at least I have found it so—to endeavor to curtail appropriations in any direction, I want the privilege of voting against it, and that is all I ask.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is no question that very many uses can be made of the school buildings and schoolrooms for education purposes other than the teaching of children. They are public buildings; the people are interested in and own them; and why should the people when a lecturer comes around be compelled to go to the expense of hiring a theater, which would probably cost \$100, in order that they may listen to an address that will have a tendency to elevate mankind and be of great benefit to those who hear it? In some sections of the city there are no halls, and it would be very inconvenient if a question arose of great moment to the people of one of those sections if it became necessary to hold a public meeting at a theater down town. During this war it is very important to have meetings to encourage philanthropic work for our soldiers and people for the obtaining of subscriptions to liberty loans, thrift stamps, and Red Cross work. Art lectures, musical entertainments, and debating societies are elevating in their influence.

This question has been discussed considerably, at least in the State of Colorado, and there we have the schools open for such purposes. It is in the interest of economy; it is in the interest of education; it has a tendency to draw people to highly intellectual lectures and speeches; and I can not see, when the people own these buildings and when the cost is merely nominal compared to the benefit received, why we can not open the schools for purposes that the school directors may deem advisable. Of course this amendment does not mean that every kind of an entertainment will be permitted in the schools; it means that the school authorities will determine such matters themselves; and I can not see why it should not be done, when it is at such a minimum cost and when to put citizens and civic associations to the enormous expense of hiring theaters would, of course, be a very great detriment to their treasuries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if Congress some time ago did not pass a bill covering the subject; and if this is not an appropriation to carry out

that law? We passed it through the Senate I know, and I thought it became a law; but I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not remember whether or not that is true, but, whether or not it is true, I can not see, when we have the buildings, when the buildings are heated, and when there is hardly any expense involved, and when citizens of the District of Columbia want to have a discussion upon some question, or if they want to have a meeting relative to what is best for their section of the city, why they should be put to unnecessary expense by being compelled to hire halls at enormous expense.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator will permit me to say that I agree with him in that. I did not ask the question as indicating my opposition to this, but I thought we had passed general legislation that would cover the matter.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know; I do not remember whether we passed it or not. If we did, there is still more reason for this appropriation, and I am glad it meets with the Senator's approval. Whether we did or not, however, it seems to me it is time that these buildings should be utilized for additional educational purposes and for community meetings that are for the benefit of the people, and at which questions can be discussed that are of interest to them. I therefore hope this amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Fire department," on page 27, line 1, after the words "fire boat," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs to and improvements of the fire boat, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical charities," on page 28, after line 17, to insert:

Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital: For the purchase and installation of a new elevator in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, \$12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water service," at the top of page 31, to insert:

For constructing 24-inch water main in Twenty-first Street from Virginia Avenue to B Street, and in B Street between Seventeenth and Twenty-first Streets, \$39,600; and for constructing 16-inch water main in B Street between Twenty-first and Twenty-sixth Streets and in Twenty-sixth Street between B and D Streets, \$18,700; and for constructing a 20-inch water main in Missouri Avenue between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets, NW, \$6,000; and for constructing 12-inch water main in the Mall between Seventh and Ninth Streets and B Street north and B Street south, \$2,400; in all, \$66,700, to continue available during the fiscal year 1913.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 32, after line 13, to insert:

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES.

For the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the existing situation may demand: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall submit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing by bureaus or offices the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the annual rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided further*, That no more than 30 persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$1,800 per annum each and not exceeding \$2,400 per annum each, \$4,470,747.30.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if this is the only authority under the law for the employment of this additional force?

Mr. MARTIN. These people are employed now. They are there, working for the Government, and this deficiency results from that service.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. A careful reading of the amendment would indicate that the authority to employ was not limited to any other law than the authority contained in this appropriation. The point I am getting at is whether these people are employed through the Civil Service Commission or whether they are regarded as temporary employees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think I can explain this matter to the Senator. Last summer, when the war broke out and the necessity arose for a large number of additional clerks in the War Department, the Committee on Appropriations placed in a deficiency bill—I have forgotten whether it was the one we passed in July or the one we passed in October; I think it was the first one—a provision following this language, providing for temporary clerks; but, as Congress was going to meet in December, we did not put in that bill a sufficient amount of money to carry them through the year, believing that when

we met in December we would have a better viewpoint from which to determine the question of its continuation. This is not to employ new clerks at this time, but it is to pay the salaries of clerks that were employed last summer and fall, under the former appropriation, up to and including the last day of the fiscal year.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There could be no doubt about the authority of the Secretary of War to appoint new clerks under this provision.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He had that under the other provision.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I notice in the first proviso that the Secretary of War is to submit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing by bureaus, and so forth, the number and designation of the people employed. The only point I want to make is this: Of course he must have the help needed, and he must have the money to pay them; but I am frequently met with the suggestion that there is no way to employ clerks in these bureaus except through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, these clerks come from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yet I think, under the authority contained in that language, the Secretary of War has the right to appoint anybody he pleases.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; no. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not see any limitation in this language.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It does not require a limitation here. Under the general law, if we make an appropriation authorizing the appointment of clerks and do not waive the civil-service requirement, the Government is required to get them under the civil-service statute.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will permit me, while for a brief time when the emergency was very great there were clerks appointed without reference to the civil-service law in a temporary capacity—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was because the Executive waived it, not because we waived it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; exactly. At the present time, as I understand the matter—I have been so informed by the Civil Service Commission—these appointments are all made in accordance with the civil-service law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I would not have the Senator from Alabama misunderstand me. I was not pleading the cause of the Civil Service Commission, because I think just as good help can be selected by using the judgment and discretion of executive officers or departmental officers as can be obtained by a civil-service examination which does not examine, and I am not so keen about preserving the rights of the Civil Service Commission; but I should like to have the interpretation of the committee as to whether or not under this language there is sufficient power granted to enable the Secretary of War to select this additional force in his own way without any reference to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly the language here does not authorize him to select them except through the Civil Service Commission. Of course the President has always had the power to waive the civil-service requirement if he wants to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if it be true that the employees provided by this part of the bill can only be appointed through the Civil Service Commission, I shall vote for the bill with great reluctance. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 33, after line 4, to insert:

OFFICE OF CHIEF OF ORDNANCE.

The Chief of Ordnance is authorized to appoint one of the Army officers serving in his office as disbursing officer to pay the civilian employees in the Ordnance Office authorized in the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved October 6, 1917, and the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on page 33, at the end of line 8, I move to insert the words "this act." The amendment, as it stands, is not broad enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 8, in the committee amendment, after the words "authorized in," it is proposed to insert the words "this act."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does not the Senator wish to put in some other words there to connect that up?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. TOWNSEND. You have not made your sentence complete by just putting that in without connecting it up with the balance of the language.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see any necessity for adding anything. It now reads "in the Ordnance Office authorized in this act." That is perfect without any other words. There should be a comma after the word "act"; then comes "the urgent deficiency appropriation act," and so forth. I move to insert a comma after the word "act." That is all that is necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will be authorized to insert a comma after the word "act."

The SECRETARY. So that it will read "authorized in this act, the urgent deficiency appropriation act," and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I noticed in the papers two or three weeks ago a statement to the effect that, as I understood it, the War Department had sent down estimates to Congress asking for \$400,000,000 for the Ordnance Bureau in order that they might make the necessary contracts for guns and things of that kind. I will ask the chairman of the committee if such an estimate has come to Congress?

Mr. MARTIN. Such an estimate has not reached the committee. I have been advised of it. It will have to be provided for, possibly, later on; but it is not provided for in this bill, because it has not yet reached the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But if it should get to Congress before this bill is disposed of I hope it will be considered in connection with this measure. It was stated in the paper—I did not feel that there was any basis for it—that some of the leaders of Congress had gotten together and had decided that an appropriation of that kind could be put over to some other bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not think that appropriation is of such an urgent character as to require any delay in this urgent deficiency bill. It embraces, as was stated to me by the officer who came to the committee room about it, our coast defenses. For instance, the first thing in it is an item of \$84,000,000 for the construction of heavy guns, and we were told that two years would elapse before the first gun manufactured would be ready for use. It is not a matter that is so urgent as to require any delay in the consideration of this bill, and it is a large item that requires careful investigation. Furthermore, as I say, it has not yet reached the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It did not involve appropriations for Army supplies, guns, and so forth, that were immediately needed in connection with the war that is now going on?

Mr. MARTIN. It did not, as it was explained to me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, Mr. President, the only information I had was what I saw in the paper. Apparently some representative of the department has been to the committee; and if it does not call for an appropriation in order to furnish guns and ammunition and supplies for the immediate conduct of this war, of course I do not think it would be necessary to go on this bill. If it does contemplate appropriations that the War Department considers it necessary and important that we should make early provision for, then I would be strongly in favor of covering the matter in this bill, because we do not want to withhold from the department anything that it deems necessary and essential to the effective conduct of this war, and I know that the chairman of the committee does not desire to do so.

Mr. MARTIN. I am in full accord with the Senator, but that is not involved in this amendment. It can easily go until a more convenient time. It will have early consideration just as soon as the data is furnished.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 34, line 4, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "\$488,000" and insert "\$738,208.83," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange; books of reference, blank books, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps; typewriters and adding machines; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, fuel, gas, and heating apparatus for and repairs to buildings (outside of the State, War, and Navy Department Building) occupied by the War Department and its bureaus; purchase, exchange, care, and subsistence of horses, and the purchase, maintenance, repair, and exchange of wagons, motor trucks, and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and harness, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; street car tickets, not exceeding \$300; and other absolutely necessary expenses, including a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence, \$738,208.83.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 8, to insert: For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the War Department and its bureaus and offices, \$289,899.95.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if this is necessary in addition to the acres of buildings that have been put up here at enormous expense?

Mr. MARTIN. This liability has already been incurred, so that it is impossible to avoid making this provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 11, to insert:

Authority is given the Secretary of War to erect a telephone switchboard building on lots numbered 5 and 6, block 169, situated between Seventeenth and Eighteenth and F and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Armories and arsenals," on page 34, line 18, before the word "Arsenal," to strike out "Benecia" and insert "Benicia," so as to make the clause read:

Benicia Arsenal, Cal.: For additional for an addition to the main issuing and receiving storehouse, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 5, to insert:

For additional for improving water-power plant, Rock Island Arsenal, \$95,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 17, to insert:

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.: For extension of main office building, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 36, after line 4, to insert:

Executive Mansion: For fuel for the Executive Mansion and greenhouses, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 36, after line 6, to insert:

Heating offices, watchmen's lodges, etc.: For heating offices, watchmen's lodges, and greenhouses at the propagating gardens, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 36, after line 11, to insert:

For fuel, lights, oil, waste, packing, tools, matches, paints, brushes, brooms, lanterns, rope, nails, screws, lead, electric lights, heating apparatus, oil stoves for elevator car and upper and lower floors, repairs to engines, boilers, dynamos, elevator, and repairs of all kinds connected with the Monument and machinery; and purchase of all necessary articles for keeping the Monument, machinery, elevator, and electric plant in good order, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Military Establishment," subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 37, line 15, after the words "authorized by law," to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$5,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

Mileage: For mileage to commissioned officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, \$5,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection, etc., on page 40, line 1, after the word "report," to strike out "\$23,203,076" and insert "\$28,358,176," so as to read:

For remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands and for labor and expenses incident thereto, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of War, the cost of irrigation; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange of same, including blank books and blank forms for the Quartermaster Corps, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, \$28,358,176.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 9, to insert:

War Port Board: For necessary expenses of the War Port Board, port of New York, \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for barracks and quarters, on page 46, line 14, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$52,151,604" and insert "\$67,252,744," so as to read:

For the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War;

for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$67,252,744.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 7, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$13,996,820" and insert "\$20,181,820," so as to make the clause read:

Water and sewers at military posts: For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situations require it to be brought from a distance; for the installation and extension of plumbing within buildings where the same is not specifically provided for in other appropriations; for the purchase and repair of fire apparatus, including fire-alarm systems; for the disposal of sewage, and expenses incident thereto, including the authorized issue of toilet paper; for repairs to water and sewer systems and plumbing within buildings; for hire of employees, \$20,181,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 13, after the word "stations," to strike out "\$7,303,800" and insert "\$9,944,100," so as to make the clause read:

Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage: For the construction and repair by the Quartermaster Corps of road, walks, and wharves; pay of employees; disposal of drainage; dredging channels; and care and improvement of grounds at military posts and stations, \$9,944,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 4, after the word "sewers," to insert "electric work, cooking apparatus"; and in the same line, after the word "same," to strike out "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$21,274,300," so as to make the clause read:

Construction and repair of hospitals: For construction and repair of hospitals at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same; construction and repair of general hospitals and expenses incident thereto; additions needed to meet the requirements of increased garrisons, temporary hospitals in standing camps and cantonments; and, during the fiscal year 1918, for the alteration of permanent buildings at posts for use as hospitals, construction and repair of temporary hospital buildings at permanent posts, construction and repair of temporary general hospitals, rental of grounds and rental and alteration of buildings for use for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including necessary temporary quarters for hospital personnel, out-buildings, heating and laundry apparatus, plumbing, water and sewers, electric work, cooking apparatus, and roads and walks for the same, \$21,274,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 12, to insert:

Claims of officers and enlisted men for loss of private property destroyed in the military service: The act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885 (chap. 335, 23d Stats., p. 350), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Property belonging to officers, enlisted men, and members of the Nurse Corps (female) of the Army, which they are required by law or regulations to own and use in the performance of their duties, and horses and equipment required by law or regulations to be provided by, mounted officers, which since the 5th day of April, 1917, has been, or shall hereafter be, lost, damaged, or destroyed in the military service, shall be replaced, or the damage thereto, or its value, recouped, to the owner as hereinafter provided, when such loss, damage, or destruction has occurred or shall hereafter occur in any of the following circumstances:

"First. When such loss or destruction was without fault or negligence on the part of the owner.

"Second. When such private property so lost or destroyed was shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment, or destroyed by the enemy or by shipwreck.

"Third. When it appears that such private property was so lost or destroyed in consequence of its owner having given his attention to the saving of property belonging to the United States which was in danger at the same time and in similar circumstances.

"Fourth. When such private property is destroyed or captured by the enemy, or is destroyed to prevent its falling into the hands of the enemy, or is abandoned on account of lack of transportation or by reason of military emergency requiring its abandonment.

"SEC. 2. The proper accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to examine into, ascertain, and determine the value of such property lost, destroyed, captured, or abandoned as specified in the foregoing sections, or the amount of the damage thereto, as the case may be; and the amount of such value or damage so ascertained and determined shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or such property lost, destroyed, captured, or abandoned, or so damaged as to be unfit for service, may be replaced in kind from Government property on hand by the supply officer or quartermaster of the organization to which the person entitled thereto belongs or with which he is serving upon the order of the commanding officer thereof.

"SEC. 3. Tender of replacement or the determination made by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury upon a claim presented as provided for in the foregoing section shall constitute a final determination of any claim cognizable under this act, and such claim shall not thereafter be reopened or considered.

"SEC. 4. No claim arising under this act shall be considered unless made within one year from the time that it accrued, or presented within six months after peace is established."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this amendment, of course, is new legislation. The necessity for putting it in this bill is that it requires immediate action. There is a law on

the statute books to-day which provides for the replacement of property lost and destroyed that belongs to officers and soldiers during time of peace, but for some reason it does not apply to time of war. A notable instance of the way we need this law is the case of the *Tuscania*, which went down by reason of being sunk by an enemy torpedo. The officers and soldiers on the ship were required to leave without taking their property, and when they landed without any clothes, it was necessary for the American officers abroad personally to indorse their notes, I am told, so as to get additional equipment of clothing, because there was no law on the statute books that allowed Government action.

This is intended to allow the Government to take care of the situation so that where the property is destroyed of an officer or soldier without fault on his part the Government can immediately replace it in kind, or if it is his personal property and it can not be replaced in kind, they can pay him the value of it if he makes the claim within six months. But, of course, the bill only applies to that class of property which the Government regulations require that a soldier shall have. It does not apply to anything except his uniform, his sword, or other personal property that the law requires him to have.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in addition, that this amendment was submitted to the War Department. It has been gone over by them and meets their approval. I wish to offer an amendment that has been suggested by the officer in the War Department who passed on the matter. There are really two amendments, but I ask the Secretary to read them one at a time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 51, line 10, after the word "hand," the last word in the line, insert "or an adequate commutation given therefor when replacement in kind can not be made within a reasonable time."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not quite sure whether the language I sent to the desk follows exactly the suggestion which came from the War Department. It was in line 10, page 51, to insert, after the word "hand" the words "or an adequate commutation given therefor when replacement in kind can not be made or can not be made within a reasonable time."

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, down to line 24 the amendment sets out precisely what has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs as Senate bill 2527, and on March 2, at the suggestion of the department, I offered an amendment to that bill. The amendment now proposed by the Senator from Alabama is in accordance with the letter of the War Department and in accordance with the amendment which I offered to the Senate bill. I think, if this amendment is agreed to, the Senate bill might as well be indefinitely postponed, as it covers the same matter. I have here the letter from the department.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will of course wait until the bill has gone to conference and this matter has been finally passed upon before striking the Senate bill off the calendar.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course. I merely suggest that that might be the course taken with that bill. I have a letter from the Secretary of War on the subject, if the Senator desires to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would be glad if the Senator would send it to the desk.

Mr. FLETCHER. It gives the reasons for it and suggests the amendment which the Senator offered on the part of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 27, 1918.
United States Senate.

To the CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

SIR: I have the honor to request your assistance in amending certain sections of Senate bill 3527. The necessity of these amendments arises from the fact that nothing in the bill provides for commutation for property lost, but only for its replacement in kind. It is not always possible to make a replacement in kind, as, for instance, in the uniform of nurses. Nurses furnish their own uniforms and the Government has no such property on hand. Again, it has been brought to my attention by the sinking of the S. S. *Tuscania* that replacement in kind can not be made in England within a reasonable time, at least with regard to officers. By the amendments requested, the purposes of the bill will be accomplished.

The amendments I suggest are as follows:

In line 9, page 51. Interpolate after the word "hand" the following: "Or an adequate commutation given therefor when replacement in kind can not be made or can not be made within a reasonable time"; and on the same page, in line 14, interpolate after the word "replacement" "or of commutation."

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The second amendment to the amendment sent to the desk by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, after the word "replacement," insert the words "or of commutation," so as to read:

Tender of replacement or of commutation or the determination made by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. The part in italics, beginning at line 24, on page 51, going down to line 18, on page 52, has not been reached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that is another amendment, and it has not yet been read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word. I like the original amendment reported by the committee a great deal better than I do the amendment as amended. I think when the Government of the United States is perfectly willing to replace the property that has been lost by an officer from the Government property on hand it is going far enough. As I understand the amendment, they are either to replace it by property on hand or they are to pay for the property lost.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Utah will allow me, as I understand the amendment it only allows them to pay it when they can not replace it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what it says.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I thought the amendment intended, but that is not what the amendment says. I shall not take further time of the Senate, but I will ask the Senator having the bill in charge to consider it when it comes into conference. It seems to me that the wording does not cover the point that ought to be covered.

Mr. MARTIN. I agree with the Senator from Utah. I think it is covered. If it is not it is the intention to cover it, and it will be made to cover it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not understand it exactly, and I ask for information. In some of these cases, where the officers lost their effects upon the *Tuscania*, for example, and other officers furnished them money and credit to replace their kit are you going to refuse to pay them, provided you can replace it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The proposition merely provides that when they can not be replaced in kind, and, of course, in that kind of a case where it has already been replaced in kind they can not do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you were an officer and lost your pocket-book and your watch and I gave you the money and you bought a new outfit—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But that was not this case. It is in the discretion of the department to pay those men the cash for what they paid out, and I have no doubt it will be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this amendment is adopted you could not do that if you could replace it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In this case you can not do it. The amendment was suggested by the War Department for the very purpose of meeting that case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think your amendment as it is now does cover it. If there is an additional amendment put on in conference then you will get into a box so far as this particular case is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 23, to insert:

So much of section 16 of the act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes, approved June 3, 1916, as provides that the Veterinary Corps as therein constituted shall be a part of the Medical Department of the Army, is hereby amended so as to make the Veterinary Corps a part of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army; and, further, so as to authorize appointments of reserve veterinarians in the Veterinary Corps upon the recommendation of the Quartermaster General of the Army: *Provided*, That all appropriations made for the purchase of veterinary supplies and the hire of veterinary surgeons shall be available for the purposes for which made, and shall hereafter be disbursed through the Quartermaster Corps: *Provided further*, That hereafter all construction and repair work under the War Department shall be executed through the Engineer Department of the Army, and all appropriations made for such work shall be available for the purposes for which made, and disbursed through said Engineer Department of the Army.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, that is merely a change in the law of June 3, 1916, section 9 thereof. It also changes the whole system under which the cantonments were being constructed

and the hospital work. It seems to me that it is a subject which ought to go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Therefore I am constrained to make a point of order against this amendment, that it is legislation attached to an appropriation bill, and is also changing existing law.

Mr. MARTIN. I am satisfied that the point of order is well taken, and I am the more willing that it should go out because there is some confusion about the matter anyhow. After the amendment was put in the bill by the committee we received a further communication from the War Department which left the matter in an unsatisfactory shape in the minds of the committee. All I desire to say on the present occasion is that I am satisfied the point of order is well taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLETCHER. That does not apply to what has already been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. It applies to the amendment beginning at line 24, page 51, and ending a line 17, on page 52.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct. It is ruled out.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is stricken out.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 55, line 7, after the word "arms," to strike out "\$27,996.100" and insert "\$33,996.100," so as to make the clause read:

Manufacture of arms. For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms, \$33,996.100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 7, to insert:

Terminal storage and shipping buildings: For terminal storage and shipping buildings and other facilities, including rentals and purchases of lands, \$5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "State, War, and Navy Department Buildings," on page 58, line 6, after the words "as follows," to insert "Assistant superintendent, \$2,000"; in line 7, before the words "One of class 3," to strike out "Clerks" and insert "clerks"; in line 8, after the word "messenger," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 10, before the words "at \$1,200 each," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "three at \$1,000 each"; in line 12, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to insert "two carpenters at \$1,000 each"; in line 14, before the words "general mechanics," to strike out "eight" and insert "ten"; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "chief engineer, \$1,400"; in line 15, after the words "assistant engineers," to strike out "two at \$1,400 each"; in line 16, before the words "at \$1,200 each," to strike out "two" and insert "four"; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "steamfitter, \$1,080"; in line 18, before the words "at \$600 each," to strike out "thirty" and insert "fifty"; in line 20, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "one hundred and thirty-five" and insert "one hundred and fifty-five"; in line 22, before the word "forewomen," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in the same line, before the words "at \$240 each," to strike out "sixty" and insert "eighty"; and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$67,466.67" and insert "\$81,900," so as to make the clause read:

War and Navy Department Buildings (Henry Park Reservation): For the following employees from March 1 to June 30, 1918, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation, as follows: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 2 of class 1, 1 at \$1,000; 3 messengers, at \$720 each; electricians—chief \$1,400, 2 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 plumbers, at \$1,200 each; machinist, \$1,200; foreman, \$1,500; 2 painters, at \$1,200 each; 4 carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 2 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 3 switchboard operators, at \$1,000 each; 10 general mechanics, at \$1,000 each; chief engineer, \$1,400; assistant engineers—4 at \$1,200 each; steamfitter, \$1,080; firemen—7 at \$840 each, 11 at \$720 each; laborers—foreman \$1,000, 50 at \$600 each; 9 female laborers, at \$480 each; guards—captain \$1,600, 3 lieutenants at \$1,000 each, 6 sergeants at \$840 each, 155 at \$720 each; charwomen—4 forewomen at \$300 each, 80 at \$240 each; in all, \$81,900.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask a correction in the spelling of the word "eighty," in line 22, on page 58. It should be "eighty" instead of "eighthy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That correction will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 23, to strike out:

Provided, That the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and chief engineer of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings shall serve in similar capacities in connection with these buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 2, to insert:

The superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings shall serve in a similar capacity in connection with these buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 8, to insert:
For completing construction of the temporary office buildings for the War and Navy Departments in Henry Park, as authorized in the urgent deficiency act approved October 6, 1917, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Temporary office buildings," on page 60, line 6, after "\$3,775,000," to insert:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to contract for the heating of the buildings authorized in this paragraph in lieu of the erection and operation of a heating plant authorized therefor, if in his discretion the contracting for said heating is more economical and to the best interests of the Government.

So as to make the clause read:

For two three-story temporary office buildings of reinforced concrete with wings 60 feet wide, one for the Navy Department to contain approximately 940,000 square feet and one for the War Department to contain approximately 835,000 square feet, to be erected under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy in Potomac Park west of Seventeenth Street and South of B Street, beginning with the Navy Department Building at a point not less than 235 feet west of the westerly curb line of Seventeenth Street and 50 feet south from the southerly curb line of B Street and extending southerly not more than 620 feet from the said B Street curb line and westerly to a point not beyond the easterly building line of Twenty-first Street, including electrical equipment and a temporary heating plant for both buildings, to be located south of D Street and west of Twenty-fifth Street, with necessary connecting mains, \$5,775,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to contract for the heating of the buildings authorized in this paragraph in lieu of the erection and operation of a heating plant authorized therefor, if in his discretion the contracting for said heating is more economical and to the best interests of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 18, before the word "streets," to strike out "Eighth" and insert "Ninth," so as to make the clause read:

For two three-story temporary office buildings of the type erected in Henry Park, one to be located in Seaton Park (north) between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets and south of Missouri Avenue and to contain approximately 370,000 square feet and one to be located on the Mall between Seventh and Ninth Streets and B Street north and B Street south and to contain approximately 300,000 square feet, and for a three-story temporary office building of reinforced concrete to be located in Seaton Park (south) between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets and north of Maine Avenue and to contain approximately 270,000 square feet, including heating and lighting and the necessary connections, to be erected under the direction of the Secretary of War for the use of the War Department, \$2,377,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 3, after the words "direction of the," to strike out "officer in charge of public buildings and grounds" and insert "superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings," so as to make the clause read:

The maintenance and protection of all of the foregoing temporary buildings when completed shall be under the supervision and direction of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," subhead "Temporary employees," on page 64, after line 8, to insert:

Office of the Secretary, \$1,575.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 13, after the words "In all," to strike out "\$63,750" and insert "\$65,325," so as to read:

In all, \$65,325.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 64, after line 18, to insert:

For professional and technical books and periodicals, law books, and necessary reference books, including city directories, railway guides, freight, passenger, and express tariff books, for department library, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Ordnance," on page 70, line 19, after the word "plant," to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$5,499,737," so as to make the clause read:

Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.: For tools and machinery plant, \$5,499,737.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 19, to insert:
Contingent, Bureau of Ordnance: For miscellaneous items, namely, cartage, expenses of light and water at ammunition depots and stations, tools, ferrage, technical books, and incidental expenses attending inspection of ordnance material, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 72, line 10, after the words "on

leave," to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$4,144,000," so as to read:

Maintenance, Bureau Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely: For books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery, operation or repair; purchase of maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber, wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes, and including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards; tools and repair of the same; stationery; furniture for Government houses and offices in navy yards and naval stations; coal and other fuel; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up yards and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, and fire apparatus and plants; incidental labor at navy yards; water tax, tolls, and ferrage; pay of watchmen in navy yards; awnings and packing boxes; and for pay of employees on leave, \$4,144,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 73, line 2, after the words "medical supplies," to strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$7,750,000," so as to make the clause read:

Hospital construction: For temporary hospital construction and repairs, as may be necessary at points not provided with suitable hospital facilities, and for buildings for naval medical supplies, \$7,750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 9, after the words "Bureau of Ordnance," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

Ordnance stations: For improvements at stations under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Ordnance, \$2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 15, after the words "construction of ships," to strike out "\$1,570,000" and insert "\$3,140,000," so as to make the clause read:

Improvement and equipment of navy yards: To enable the Secretary of the Navy to add to the equipment of navy yards suitable and necessary machinery, implements, building ways, and other facilities for the construction of ships, \$3,140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 20, after the words "nineteen hundred and seventeen," to strike out "\$55,072.25" and insert "\$222,935," so as to make the clause read:

Hampton Roads, Va., naval operating base: For additional for payment of compensation for property taken over under the authority contained in the deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, \$222,935, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 74, to insert:

Purchase of land for warehouses, South Brooklyn, N. Y.: For the purchase of land for terminal warehouses between Twenty-eighth and Thirty-second Streets and Second and Third Avenues, South Brooklyn, N. Y., \$705,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 7, after the word "stations," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations: For repairs and preservation at navy yards, fuel depots, fuel plants, and stations, \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 74, line 25, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: The limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 on expenditures from the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," for pay of clerical, inspection, storemen, store laborers, and messenger service is further increased by the sum of \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 10, after the word "classify," to increase from \$800,000 to \$1,180,000 the total of the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Marine Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 78, after line 20, to strike out:

INDIAN SERVICE.

For support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools, in addition to the general and specific appropriations made for that purpose in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended upon improvements or used to increase the compensation of employees: *Provided further*, That except for pay for superintendents and for transportation of goods and supplies and transportation of pupils, not more than \$200 shall be expended from appropriations made in this act for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any Indian school, unless the attendance in any school shall be less than 100 pupils, in which case the Secretary of the Interior may authorize a per capita expenditure not to exceed \$225: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated for the support of such school shall not be exceeded: *Provided further*, That the number of pupils in any school entitled to the per capita allowance hereby provided for shall be determined by taking the average attendance for the entire fiscal year and not any fractional part thereof.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, with particular reference to the amendment of the committee commencing in line 21, on page 78, and extending down to and including line 17, on page 79, I wish to make a brief statement, and will premise the statement by saying that no one could appreciate more than I the necessity for haste with reference to the passage of this bill—

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator from Arizona will excuse me for interrupting him, if he will charge himself with seeing that the item goes out in the Indian appropriation bill, I shall consent that the committee amendment be disagreed to. The committee reported to leave the item out of this bill because it was contained in the Indian appropriation bill, and we did not like to carry the same item in two bills, both being on the Calendar of the Senate at the same time. However as there seems to be some urgency about this matter, and there may be some evil consequences if what is provided for in the item is not done directly, I have no objection to the provision staying in the bill, with the assurance of the Senator from Arizona that it will go out of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, first I thank the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, and wish to assure him that, of course, the similar item which is carried in the Indian appropriation bill will most certainly be stricken from that bill. I wish to give the most positive assurance that that will not escape the attention of myself or of the Senate when the Indian appropriation bill comes before the Senate. Again thanking the Senator from Virginia, I ask that the amendment of the committee be disagreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 79, after line 17, to strike out:

Not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds derived from the sale of timber from the Red Lake Indian Forest, Minn., under authority of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat., p. 137), may be expended by the Secretary of the Interior in the logging, booming, towing, and manufacturing of timber from burned-over areas at the Red Lake Agency sawmill and in the reimbursement from the said timber receipts of the amounts expended from other Indian tribal funds in the prosecution of such work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Geological Survey," on page 80, line 21, after the word "laws," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$250,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the examination and classification of lands requisite to the determination of their suitability for enlarged homesteads, stock-raising homesteads, public waterlike places, and stock driveways, as required by the public land laws, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 14, to insert:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.

The annual compensation of the employees holding the following positions shall be increased as follows: Head baker, from \$780 to \$924; assistant baker, from \$420 to \$660; first assistant baker, from \$420 to \$660; 5 special attendants, from \$360 to \$726 each; foreman of laundry, from \$920 to \$1,200; 6 laundresses, from \$300 to \$480 each; 3 cooks, from \$300 to \$600 each; 8 kitchen helpers, from \$168 to \$300 each; electrical engineer, from \$1,200 to \$1,600; and foreman of electrical construction, from \$1,100 to \$1,400, and the accounting officers of the Treasury shall credit the disbursing agent for payments made, or which shall be made to employees filling the positions named at the annual compensation above stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," on page 83, after line 8, to insert:

OFFICE OF POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For enforcement of title 12 of the espionage act, approved June 15, 1917, and section 19 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, approved October 6, 1917, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Postal Service," subhead "Out of the Postal Revenues, Office of First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 84, line 3, after the word "second classes," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous items necessary and incidental to post offices of the first and second classes, \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 8, after the word "services," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$600,000," so as to make the clause read:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles, for and the operation of, screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 9, after the word "service," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$400,000," so as to make the clause read:

For mail messenger service, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 11, to insert:

OFFICE OF THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For manufacture of adhesive postage stamps, special-delivery stamps, books of stamps, and for coiling of stamps, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 15, to insert:

For manufacture of stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers, \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 17, to insert:

For payment of limited indemnity for the injury or loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail, \$180,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 84, after line 22, to insert:

For stationery for the Postal Service, including blanks, books, printed and engraved matter, binding and carbon paper, and other miscellaneous items for the money-order and registry systems; also the preparation, publication, and free distribution by postmasters to the public of pamphlet containing general postal information; and also pay of one envelope inspector at \$1,800 per annum, and one assistant at \$900 per annum, \$160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 6, to insert:

For postmarking, rating, money-order stamps, and electrotype plates, and repairs to same, metal, rubber, and combination type, dates and figures, type holders, ink and pads for canceling and stamping purposes, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 10, to insert:

For defraying expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, cartage, freight, and the pay of one carpenter at \$1,200 per annum, and nine requisition filers, at \$900 each per annum, for assignment in connection therewith, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 15, to insert:

For equipment for City Delivery Service, including letter boxes, letter-box fasteners, package boxes, posts, furniture, and the erecting and painting of same, also trucks, baskets, satchels, straps, time cards, and time-card frames, and the repairing of such equipment, and for the purchase and repair of presses and dies and manufacture of letter boxes, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 22, to insert:

For mail bags and equipment, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 86, after line 7, to insert:

For furniture and repairs, including carpets, file holders and cases, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 9, to insert:

For stationery for department and its several bureaus, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 11, to insert:

For miscellaneous expenditures, including telegraphing, fuel, lights, foreign postage, labor, repairs of buildings, care of grounds, books of reference, periodicals, typewriters and adding machines and exchange of same, street car tickets not exceeding \$200, and other necessities, directly ordered by the Attorney General, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 93, line 7, before the word "not," to strike out "and" and insert "at"; in line 11, after the word "each," to strike out: "in all, \$3,600," and insert "3 dynamo tenders, \$1,080 each; 3 laborers, \$840; in all, \$5,040," so as to make the clause read:

For additional employees from April 1 to June 30, 1918, inclusive, at not exceeding annual rates of compensation as follows: Six astronomical, geodetic, tidal, and miscellaneous computers, \$1,200 each; 3 topographic and hydrographic draftsmen, \$1,200 each; 3 clerks, \$1,200 each; 3 dynamo tenders, \$1,080 each; 3 laborers, \$840; in all, \$5,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, after line 13, to insert:

For purchase of new instruments, including their exchange, materials and supplies required in the instrument shop, carpenter shop, and drawing division, books, scientific and technical books, journals, books of reference, charts, maps, and subscriptions; copper plates, chart paper, printer's ink, copper, zinc, and chemicals for electrotyping and photograving; engraving, printing, photograving, and electrotyping supplies; photolithographing charts and printing from stone and copper for

immediate use; including the employment in the District of Columbia of such personal services, other than clerical, as may be necessary for the prompt preparation of charts, not to exceed \$6,000; stationery for office and field parties; transportation of instruments and supplies when not charged to party expenses; office wagon and horses or automobile truck; heating, lighting, and power; telephones, including operation of switchboard; telegrams, ice, and washing; office furniture, repairs, traveling expenses of officers and others employed in the office sent on special duty in the service of the office; miscellaneous expenses, contingencies of all kinds, and not exceeding \$3,400 for extra labor, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Lighthouse Service," on page 94, line 16, after the word "hurricane," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

For rebuilding, repairing, and reestablishing aids to navigation and structures connected therewith on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico which have been damaged or destroyed by hurricane, \$150,000.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask that that amendment be disagreed to; and I send to the desk an amendment which accomplishes the same result, but makes a transposition to correct an error.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 94, line 16. The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will now state the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The SECRETARY. On page 94, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 96, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE.

To pay Irene M. Brady, widow of Hon. James H. Brady, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 4, to insert:

To pay Margaret Hughes, widow of William Hughes, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 6, to insert:

To pay Edith McAllister Newlands, widow of Hon. Francis G. Newlands, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 9, to insert:

To pay John P. Husting and Mary Husting, heirs at law of Hon. Paul O. Husting, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 12, to insert:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For two additional telephone operators from April 1 to June 30, 1918, inclusive, at the rate of \$900 per annum each, \$450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 16, to insert:

Contingent expenses: For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 18, to insert:

For the Capitol: For repairs, improvements, and equipment for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended by the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, which I think the chairman of the committee will accept. It is in accordance with an estimate made by Mr. Woods, Superintendent of the Capitol Buildings and Grounds, and submitted to the Committee on Rules. It was passed upon favorably by the Committee on Rules, but for some reason, either through my mistake or that of some one else, it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, although I thought it had been. It is, as I have stated, estimated for and has been passed upon by a standing committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the bottom of page 96 it is proposed to insert the following:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, and for all necessary personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, \$8,500.

Mr. MARTIN. I am satisfied that that is correct; I think the appropriation is necessary, and I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. Now, in the amendment of the committee which has been agreed to on page 96, line 21, I desire to move to strike out the words "and Senate Office Building." With that in view, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment beginning on line 19, on page 96, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment referred to was agreed to, will be reconsidered. The question is now on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Virginia if all the committee amendments have been acted on?

Mr. MARTIN. Not quite all.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to offer an amendment, but I do not wish to interfere with action upon the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 97, after line 18 to insert:

Office of the Clerk: For two additional telephone operators from April 1 to June 30, 1918, inclusive, at the rate of \$900 per annum each, \$450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Government Printing Office," subhead "Printing and binding," on page 99, line 9, after the words "offices," to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,585,841.49," so as to read:

For printing and binding for the War Department and its bureaus and offices, \$1,585,841.49.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER obtained the floor.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 99, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

For printing and binding for the Navy Department, \$100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will inquire of the Senator from Virginia had that not better come in under the Navy Department items? The Senator has put it under the Government Printing Office items.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it had better come in under "Printing and binding"; I think that is the logical place, although it is immaterial where it comes so that it is in the bill. I think it is more logical, however, to put it where I have requested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. After reading the amendment on page 96, beginning in line 19, I will say to the chairman that I think I was mistaken about striking out the words "and Senate Office Building."

Mr. MARTIN. I was sure the Senator was.

Mr. OVERMAN. I therefore ask to disagree to the amendment I offered in line 21.

Mr. WARREN. And leave the text as it originally stood?

Mr. OVERMAN. Leave it as the committee originally reported the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator had better move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on reconsidering the vote by which the amendment on page 96, beginning in line 19, as amended, was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on reconsidering the vote by which the amendment to the amendment, in line 21, striking out the words "and Senate Office Building" to the amendment reported by the committee, was adopted. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and the amendment to the amendment is disagreed to. Now the question comes on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. I have one more amendment to offer. It is not a committee amendment, but if the Senator from New Hampshire will excuse me I will offer it now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator, of course.

Mr. MARTIN. It is a matter which the Secretary had better read. I will say that it simply permits certain munitions and Army supplies to come in free of duty. It is taking money from one pocket and putting it into another; but the officers at the War Department tell me that it will save a great deal of time and some complications to permit these war supplies to come in free of duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

During the present emergency, upon request made by the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, there may be imported into the United States, without payment of duty thereon, raw materials, parts or partly fabricated parts of equipment and finished equipment required to hasten the production of munitions or machinery of war, or other necessary war supplies, whenever such duty would otherwise be payable directly or indirectly, from appropriations for the support of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator having the bill in charge a question. The wording of the amendment in part is this:

whenever such duty would otherwise be payable, directly or indirectly, from appropriations for the support of the Army.

Do I understand that to mean that upon request of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury shall allow everything to come into the United States free whenever such duty would otherwise be payable, directly or indirectly, from appropriations for the support of the Army?

Mr. MARTIN. That is the purpose—not to collect for Army supplies, although they would be dutiable, but whenever the Secretary requests otherwise, that they shall come in duty free.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that would be all right if it applied only to payments made directly from appropriations for the support of the Army.

Mr. MARTIN. That is what it does.

Mr. SMOOT. It says "indirectly," and it seems to me, Mr. President, that that would allow everything to come into the United States free of duty that may come indirectly to the Government, or, in other words, any institution in the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, no; it must be payable at the United States Treasury. The amendment only releases duties which are payable out of the United States Treasury. If the duties are not collected out of the United States Treasury, the amendment does not touch them at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. That completes all the amendments I have to offer on behalf of the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there are two small parks running from Third Street to Sixth Street, bounded on the north by Missouri Avenue, which on two occasions the Committee on the Library has reported should be added to the Botanic Garden. They are separated from the Botanic Garden by Third Street at the present time. The Senate has passed the bill twice unanimously.

Mr. President, in this bill it is proposed to put temporary structures on those two small parks. In every other instance where temporary structures have been built, so far as I know, as a war emergency act, a provision has been made that they shall be removed within a certain definite time. I desire to offer an amendment touching those two parks, along the line that has been adopted in connection with other reservations, providing that they shall be removed within two years, and that those two parks shall be added to the Botanic Garden. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, after line 26, at the bottom of the page, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That within two years after the conclusion of the existing war the buildings provided for in this paragraph shall be removed, and the parcels of land known as East Seaton Park and West Seaton Park, lying between Third Street on the east, Sixth Street on the west, Missouri Avenue on the north, and Maine Avenue on the south, shall be attached to and become a part of the United States Botanic Garden, and available for the purposes thereof: *Provided further*, That the location of conservatories and other improvements of a permanent character which may be built within said parcels shall be confined to areas not intended as the sites for future public buildings and driveways as provided in the plan for that vicinity prepared by the park commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not know that I understand it thoroughly; but I am willing to have it adopted and go to conference, when we will investigate it carefully. I am not prepared to express an opinion about it now.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all I could ask—that it be considered in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 36, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

For reimbursement to the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred in supplying State troops at the request of the United States marshal at Boston for guard and patrol duty at Boston Harbor in the interest of the Federal Government, \$7,056 87.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, that seems to be an expenditure for war purposes made by the State of Massachusetts, and I am very willing to have it go in the bill. I think it ought to be provided for.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope the Senator understands that it is an expenditure for war purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. As I understand, it is something that the United States ought to have paid for, and they made the State of Massachusetts pay for it.

Mr. WEEKS. The expenditure was made by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at the request of the United States marshal.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it ought to go in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 16, on page 94, it is proposed to insert:

For the installation of an electrically operated fog-signal whistle on the east breakwater, Nantucket Harbor, Mass., \$15,000.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this amendment. It was suggested that possibly there was a contingent fund which would provide for this purpose. I made inquiry of the Department of Commerce, and I find that there is no fund provided for such purposes as this; and it will be necessary, therefore, to make an appropriation. At present there is no signal of any kind at the entrance to Nantucket Harbor, and I do not think that condition ought to be allowed to continue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to say that the committee has not had a chance to investigate this item. It clearly is not a deficiency, and it has not been estimated for; but if the Senator is willing to allow it to go to conference, with the understanding that the conference committee may have a full opportunity to hear the matter and exercise its judgment in conference, I see no objection.

Mr. WEEKS. I expect that that will be done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there is no objection, then.

Mr. WEEKS. It is not unlike the proposition of appropriating \$100,000 or so for repairs due to the hurricane. This is due to the breaking up of the ice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I have one more amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 84, line 11, after the figures "\$300,000," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended to pay the expense of censoring mail from the military forces connected with the American Expeditionary Force, which mail has been censored in Europe.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that no part of the appropriation would be used for that purpose under present conditions.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Utah is correctly informed on that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah got his information from the Post Office Department.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, my purpose in introducing this amendment is to prevent the necessity of censoring mail twice. I have had brought to my attention several cases where the mail of soldiers who were on the fighting line in Europe which is censored by the military censor abroad is censored again when it reaches this country—mail that is written by the soldier to his wife, to his mother, and to his father. It seems to me that that is almost an outrage, and certainly it is a waste of public money that mail should be censored twice. I want to put a limitation on that kind of expenditure of money—heaping an insult on a soldier who is actually at the front by censoring his mail a second time when it reaches this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator refer to military censoring?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Postmaster General stated to the committee positively that this duplication does not go on.

Mr. WEEKS. I can exhibit to the Senator from Virginia envelopes showing that mail is censored by the military censor in Europe and is censored again on this side.

Mr. MARTIN. I am willing to have it go into the bill, subject to a reexamination by the conferees.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to make this request of the Senator from Virginia. If that question arises, and the statement is made that mail is not censored twice, I want to be called before the conferees, so that I can demonstrate that it is censored twice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment that was not agreed to by the committee, but subsequently information came in which I think is convincing that the amendment ought to be agreed to. I ask the Secretary to state the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 81, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

War materials investigation: For inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances which are particularly needed for carrying on the war, in connection with military and manufacturing purposes, and which have heretofore been largely imported, with a view to developing domestic sources of supply and substitutes for such ores and mineral products as are particularly needed, and conserving resources through the prevention of waste in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries; and to inquire into the economic conditions affecting these industries; and including all equipment, supplies, expenses of travel, and subsistence; to continue available during the fiscal year 1919, \$150,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking from the bill all of lines 9 to 21, both inclusive, on page 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 21, both inclusive, in the following words:

UNITED STATES FOOD AND FUEL ADMINISTRATIONS.

For expenses of the United States Food and Fuel Administrations, created under authority contained in the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, including personal and other services and rent in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, traveling expenses, printing and binding, and necessary supplies and equipment, \$1,750,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the language I propose to strike out carries as an emergency appropriation for the Food and Fuel Administrations \$1,750,000. I am totally at a loss to understand how this item reaches the Senate with the approval of the House under the circumstances which appear to be disclosed by the hearing before the House committee. That hearing, at pages 1149 to 1152, shows that there is an unexpended balance on hand at the present time of \$1,257,950.23. With an unexpended balance of that magnitude, it is difficult to understand why we are called upon to appropriate as an emergency matter an additional sum of \$1,750,000.

My understanding of the purpose of an emergency appropriation is that it is to meet expenses which have been suddenly thrust upon a department or an officer which could not have been reasonably anticipated when the regular appropriation was asked. On the face of the showing made by the Food Control Department in the hearing before the committee of the House, \$1,257,950.23 is still on hand unexpended, and until and

unless this record shall show some necessity for more money, Congress, even at this time of wild and reckless extravagance, ought to hesitate to expend a million and three-quarters of money on a department that already has over a million and a quarter of money on hand unexpended.

If Senators will examine this report of Mr. Hoover I believe they will be startled, if, indeed, anything can now startle anybody. The Food Administration has had appropriated for its benefit \$5,515,000. Its primary legal existence began August 10, 1917. In addition to that, it has received from the President, out of those moneys which we gave the President to employ for such purposes as the emergency seemed to him to demand, \$340,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator repeat the first amount?

Mr. REED. The amount appropriated directly by Congress to the Food Administration is \$5,515,000. In addition to that, it appears to have received from the President, out of the President's fund, \$340,000, which, it is stated, were in the way of preliminary expenses.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri further yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator from Missouri any way of ascertaining through what avenues the expenditure of about \$6,000,000 has been made by the Food Administrator? Has it been largely for the payment of the help that he has employed throughout the country?

Mr. REED. There are two reports filed, which make up two large pamphlets. The one of them in my hands, which is principally an accounting, has approximately 190 pages in it. They comprehend many items, some of which I will comment on.

On January 31 of this year it was stated before the committee of the House that of the \$5,515,000 there had been disbursed \$1,985,429.08, but that there were encumbrances of \$2,272,383.22. Now, I pause to inquire if anybody in this Chamber ever heard of a public department of the Government being run in just that way?

Naturally, we expect bills to be paid with reasonable promptness. The Government is supposed to be a good paymaster, especially where moneys have been duly appropriated and some one has been authorized to pay the money down. Yet, on January 31, the day Mr. Hoover testified before the House committee, the amount of expenses actually paid was \$1,985,429.08, while the encumbrances, whatever that may mean, were \$2,272,383.22. I am curious to know why these bills have not been paid and reported to Congress. I want to know why they have been held back in this remarkable manner. I gather from the testimony that was given before the House committee that these encumbrances are for bills that have been incurred. I read from the testimony before the House committee:

The CHAIRMAN. From the statement you have just handed to me it appears that you had a total appropriation for the Food and Fuel Administrations of \$5,515,000; that out of that there has been an actual expenditure of \$1,985,429.08; that there are now obligations, or what are called here encumbrances, of \$2,272,383.22, leaving what you designate as an available balance—and what we frequently speak of as a free balance—of \$1,257,950.23.

Mr. HUTTELY. Yes, sir.

I repeat, I am very curious to know—and the Senate has a right to be curious when it is asked to dip into the Treasury and take out a million and three-quarters of the taxpayers' money—why these bills have not been paid, why these encumbrances exist, and what they are for. I affirm that in the whole history of this Government there has never been such a saturation of wastefulness and of extravagance as I shall show you has gone on and is going on in the Food Administration. A drunken sailor landed in port for the first time in five years and filled up with a bad quality of New England rum never threw money around as the Food Administration is now doing.

The law under which this report is made reads as follows:

SEC. 21. The President shall cause a detailed report to be made to the Congress on the 1st day of January of each year of all proceedings had under this act during the year preceding. Such report shall, in addition to other matters, contain an account of all persons appointed or employed, the salary or compensation paid or allowed each, the aggregate amount of the different kinds of property purchased or requisitioned, the use and disposition made of such property, and a statement of all receipts, payments, and expenditures, together with a statement showing the general character, and estimated value of all property then on hand, and the aggregate amount and character of all claims against the United States growing out of this act.

A statement that there are encumbrances of over two and one-fourth million dollars does not comply with that act.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Food Administration in some of its forms or organizations has large sources of income, the collection and distribution of which the country is entitled to have information about. I hold in my hand what is called a Food Administration agreement. It is entitled "Food Administration Grain Corporation," and it would appear now that they have organized a corporation. Who it is, what it is, I do not know; but this agreement, which I place in the Record and ask to have incorporated as a part of my remarks without reading all of it, contains these provisions, speaking in a very condensed form:

That the Grain Corporation agrees with the miller by the terms of which the miller agrees in purchasing wheat that he will observe and respect all the rules and regulations of the Grain Corporation. The Grain Corporation then guarantees the miller against loss by a decline, and then the miller agrees to pay to the Grain Corporation 1 per cent on all wheat purchased by him at the price level fixed by the price commissioner.

I insert the agreement in full:

[Execute in duplicate and return both copies.]

FOOD ADMINISTRATION GRAIN CORPORATION.

AGREEMENT.

This agreement, made and entered into this ____ day of ____ A. D. 1917, between the Food Administration Grain Corporation, of the one part, and the undersigned ____ of ____ (hereinafter called the miller) of the other part,

Witnesseth whereas the said Food Administration Grain Corporation has been created pursuant to an act of Congress approved August 10, 1917, and known as the food-control act; and

Whereas the undersigned ____ is a miller and is desirous of aiding and promoting the efficient administration of said act and of securing the purposes thereby to be accomplished,

Now therefore, in consideration of the premises it is mutually agreed as follows:

1. The miller hereby agrees that in purchasing wheat ____ shall observe and respect and be governed by all rules and regulations which said Food Administration Grain Corporation may from time to time enact and promulgate.

2. Said Food Administration Grain Corporation hereby expressly guarantees the miller against a loss by a decline in value on all accumulated surplus of unsold wheat bought in accordance with the grain corporation's regulations, and flour ground therefrom, in the event of a decline from the price at which said wheat was bought, which said guaranty shall be adjusted promptly after change of price. Said corporation further agrees to endeavor to maintain in available positions an adequate supply of suitable wheat to meet the milling demands of the miller at the general price level of wheat, as recommended by the Price Commission with such adjustments, by reason of freight, storage, insurance, interest or other causes as shall be deemed necessary by the grain corporation, it being the intent of the grain corporation to make no profit on sales of wheat to the miller.

3. In consideration of the assurance against a loss by a decline in price as described in paragraph 2, the miller hereby agrees to pay to the said Food Administration Grain Corporation a fee equal to 1 per cent on all wheat purchased by ____ at a price level based upon that fixed by the Price Commission established under the authority of the Food Administration, or purchased under the direction of the Grain Corporation and used by the miller for milling purposes (exclusive of grain bought to fill existing contracts). This fee shall be accounted for and paid over to the grain corporation monthly on the basis of grain so bought and actually milled during said period. This charge is intended, so far as may be, to equalize storage charges and other expenses of holding and handling grain held by the said grain corporation, and it is the intent as above of said grain corporation to make no profit in the sales of wheat to the millers.

Effective September 10, 1917.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have subscribed this agreement by their duly authorized representatives the day and year first above written.

By ____ FOOD ADMINISTRATION GRAIN CORPORATION,

Attest: ____

By ____

Attest: ____

(Return in inclosed envelope to United States Food Administration, 42 Broadway, New York City.)

Without going into details it is enough to say that the scheme worked out absolutely compels every farmer in the United States to sell his wheat at the price fixed. It compels practically every bushel of it to go through the machinery of the boards of trade and ultimately through the Grain Corporation, and compels every miller to acquire substantially his entire stock from the Grain Corporation. Consequently every bushel of wheat in the United States must pay its toll of 1 per cent to this corporation.

Mr. President, last year's wheat crop was 650,828,000 bushels. The price fixed for No. 1 northern was \$2.20, but the farmer does not realize that price. I estimated the other day that the farmer receives \$1.85, and hence I use that figure now. Six hundred and fifty million eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand bushels of wheat at \$1.85 a bushel aggregates \$1,204,031,800. One per cent upon that, which must go to this corporation organized by Mr. Hoover, brings the stupendous sum of \$12,040,318.

I want to know what has become and what is becoming of that \$12,000,000. I want to know it before Congress votes any more money to this institution. It would seem that a partial statement is made, and it appears at page 44 of the report filed on January 19. I want to read it into the Record:

[Exhibit J.]

FOOD ADMINISTRATION GRAIN CORPORATION.

Statement of receipts and disbursements for period Aug. 10, 1917, to Nov. 30, 1917, inclusive.

RECEIPTS.

Capital stock subscriptions	\$50,000,000.00
Grain and flour sales	119,779,196.12
Guarantee and operating expense fund	1,927,817.31
Reserve for marine insurance	80,629.25
Total receipts	171,787,642.68

DISBURSEMENTS.

Office furniture and fixtures	\$70,376.76
Grain and flour purchases	142,311,047.85
Accounts receivable	1,121,141.97
Expense:	
General office	\$94,103.62
Agencies	211,081.37
	305,184.99
Total disbursements	143,807,751.57
Cash balance	27,979,891.11
	171,787,642.68

Notice the item "Office furniture and fixtures, \$70,376.76."

Somebody suggests that it must be Louis XIV furniture.

Notice the item "Agencies, \$211,081.37." Also notice the enormous cash balance of \$27,979,891.11.

Mr. President, as nearly as I can decipher Mr. Hoover's accounts, he has cost the country in expense alone—

Paid out	\$1,985,429.08
Obligations	2,272,383.22
Received from President's fund	340,000.00
Grain Corporation office and agency	305,184.99
Grain Corporation office fixtures	70,376.76
Grain Corporation accounts	1,121,141.97
Total	6,094,331.03

He has cash on hand	1,257,950.23
He demands	1,750,000.00
Total	3,007,950.23

This, he says, will only run him to June 1. In other words, he will cost, for expenses alone, for 10 months, \$6,094,331.03 plus \$3,007,950.23, or \$9,102,281.26. To employ a slang phrase, "that is going some." Add to this the interest, at 4 per cent, on the fifty million he has used for six months and we have \$1,000,000, bringing the total to \$10,102,281.26. This much, if I can understand the Hoover report, we know. I would like to have further light on the Grain Corporation.

Mr. Hoover had not been appointed to the office. The bill was not passed until August 10. Every item of the expenditure that I now read to you was incurred and included in the account for June 30, over a month before the bill was passed, before it could be known by any person with certainty that Congress would pass a bill and, if so, in what form it would be passed. Yet we find this statement:

"Herbert Hoover. Expenses in preparatory work, \$5,903.74."

No date.

Ditto, ditto again, \$4,081.

Ditto and ditto again, without date, \$5,427.51.

Total, \$15,412.25.

Going over to the next page and carrying it along to the quarter ending September 30 you will find that the amount is increased to \$22,681.08.

The expenses I have read are evidently Mr. Hoover's personal expenses. If they are anything else, he is to blame for not making it plainer in his report. But he also had a pay roll, as you will find on reading page 146 of this report, which shows a pay roll, before he was ever appointed to any office by authority of law, of \$32,692.23.

That would hire a large number of dollar-a-year men, and the public has been pretty generally given to understand that Mr. Hoover's force is largely composed of patriots. Is it not a most remarkable thing that before the food bill was passed by Congress Mr. Hoover had set up an office and drawn from the Public Treasury for his own personal expenses something like \$22,000 and for employees over \$30,000?

Mr. GORE. Did these accounts pass the Comptroller of the Treasury?

Mr. REED. I do not think they go through the Comptroller. Here is a total of \$55,373.31 expended before a bill is passed, before there is any authority of law to expend a penny, and by a gentleman who has no kind of official position.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator if he has taken occasion to run through the items of expenditure in this report?

Mr. REED. Some of them I have and some of them I am going to call attention to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I notice, for instance, one here—and there are several items covering the same project—carbon paper, \$418.95, and a still more remarkable one, \$58 spent for erasers. I think it would be well for the Senator if he would ask one of his secretaries to count up what is paid out for typewriters, as the Underwood Co. has evidently had a first-class customer. Let me call the Senator's attention to the item of pencils. On one page is \$135.60, \$97.90, and \$143.84 for pencils. Then, turning over to page 2, there is another item—

Mr. REED. If the Senator wants to go to typewriters, I can tell him the page on which to find the item. On the bottom of page 158, the Senator will find these: Underwood typewriters, \$25,717.50; the Remington, \$13,510.04; the L. C. Smith, \$8,540; the Royal \$950; and the Oliver, \$49.

Mr. GALLINGER. In addition to the items for pencils, I want to read two additional items: "Pencils, \$98.90; pencils, \$203.04." There must be \$600 or thereabouts expended for pencils on these two pages. I have not had time to look up all of these expenditures.

Mr. REED. I can give the Senator some items which are even more startling than those. Let me start with the Hoover speeches.

Hoover's speeches cost the Government \$16,000; I do not know what additional commitments are included in the two and a quarter million dollars encumbrances, but the speeches that are reported cost \$16,000; and I think he also had the franking privilege; so that is \$16,000 for printing alone. Again, dropping into the vernacular, that is "a whale of a bill" for speeches—\$16,000! Of course, it is remarkable to me that they had to be circulated at all, for I can not understand why words falling from Mr. Hoover's lips would not be greedily sought after by the press of the country and circulated by the millions free through the columns of the public prints.

Again, Hoover buttons cost the Government \$40,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Buttons?

Mr. REED. I will ask the Senator to look at pages 152 and 153. Let me read a few of these items. Whitehead & Hoge Co., metal and celluloid bu tons, voucher No. 983, \$3,367. The same company have the following other items under date of October 26—this is one day's order, one day's business—\$3,083, \$5,367, \$3,700, \$3,700, \$3,700, \$3,700, \$3,700, and \$2,479. The aggregate, as I run it up, is about \$40,000. Now, I wonder how much of that would have been done if a man had been spending his own money. When we wrote the food-control bill the main purpose of which, as everybody knows, was to encourage production—it is so recited in the preamble of the bill and so recited in its body—who was it dreamed that we were going to expend \$40,000 for buttons? How much more there has been spent since the account was filed I do not know. This is what is reported. How many buttons are to be included in this \$1,750,000 that is now being asked, I inquire of the chairman, if he can tell me? Has any information been furnished to our committee upon this subject with reference to this remarkable request? But I proceed, for buttons are only one of the items.

Mr. GORE. Are they counted as encumbrances?

Mr. REED. I do not know how they are counted. Let us come to the matter of photographs. Let me read you the photograph bill: The Commercial Camera Co., \$115.67; Harris & Ewing, \$24.75; the National Photo Co., \$92, \$92.35, \$31.75, \$72.10; Harris & Ewing again, \$16, \$178.50, \$47.50, \$33; National Photo Co. again, \$116.20; Clinedinst Studio, \$614; Harris & Ewing again, \$27.70 and \$109.40; Harris & Ewing again, \$40; National Photo Co. again, \$206.40 and \$178.20; Harris & Ewing again, \$64.05 and \$24.10; Elizabeth Watson, \$13.80; Underwood & Underwood, \$12; National Photo Co., \$227.50 and again, \$155.75.

I do not know whose pictures were taken; I do not know what graceful forms and classic features may have been thus produced and sent broadcast for the delectation of our country. There is only one item that is specific. It is one of the smallest items in the list. It is the bill of Underwood & Underwood; and it is recited that it is for Hoover's picture. I have not stopped to add how many hundreds of dollars we have expended in photographs; I do not know what these photographs are; I have tried to find out, and when you telephone one of the photographers down here and ask him what this bill is for he always has to refer you to his clerk, and the clerk is always out. They talk from the other end of the wire as though they are speaking in fear and trembling lest they shall not get any more

of this work. Who was it conceived, when we were passing the food-control bill, that we were going to spend thousands of dollars for photographs.

This is a rare account. It ought to be read by everybody in the Senate. It will not be read by many, because Senators are too busy; but they ought to read it. Forty thousand dollars for buttons and thousands of dollars for photographs.

Here is another item—moving-picture slides. For the purpose of producing more wheat and more pork in this country and feeding our allies we have expended \$7,811.76 on moving-picture slides. I have seen some slides that I suspected were being produced by the Food Administration. Just as I have suspected some editorial comments that accompanied large-sized advertisements. I have seen those moving-picture slides. Generally they are very stupid reproductions of something that did nobody any good, but which always advertise the Food Administration. When you go to see them in the future and pay your 10 cents or 30 cents, or whatever it costs you to get into the particular moving-picture emporium that you patronize, you will have the sweet satisfaction of knowing that you have paid for those pictures twice—first, as a taxpayer and proprietor, and, second, as a patron of the theater.

Now, I come to another item; what it is "deponent saith not." I call attention to it as one of those mysteries that can only be understood when one has become one of the inner circle of a Federal bureau. Not having yet become an initiate, I can only read it, and out of the abundance of my ignorance submit it to you.

For medallions, \$18,000. What is this medallion? Whose medallion is it? How much does it contribute toward food production? How many soldiers will it feed in France? How many ships will it man? What is it except a wild waste of money by a man who came here and has been able to thrust his arm into the National Treasury deeper than any other man in all the history of this country.

Over \$27,000,000 on hand in one fund, over \$2,000,000 on hand in another fund, and asking for \$1,750,000 more!

But I read on. Here is the Capital Publishing Co., with an item of \$10,500; there is no description; no information.

Observe the motor-car account. I think it is imperfect. Automobiles, one, \$534.58. That must be a Ford. I do not see how they came to get a Ford car, unless it was to stand in with Henry; one, a touring car, \$1,065; a runabout, \$367; a nondescript, \$421.88.

Then we come to the question of home cards, pledge cards, and so forth. I have only run over eight pages and find items aggregating over \$33,000,000. I can not even make a wild guess as to what all these cards have cost, but there are over 20 pages of items in addition to the 8 pages I have gone over; they run into many, many thousands of dollars.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to some other items, all of which may be susceptible of easy explanation; but if you will turn to page 112 of this book you will find this curious sort of item, "Mary J. Downey, rent, 1628 L Street, \$180." Without reading, I will put in a statement showing some of these rent items:

[House Document No. 890, 55th Cong., 2d sess.]

Rent account.

Page	Address	Amount
74	1439 K Street	\$31.95
43	1721 M Street	203.00
45	1031 Vermont Avenue	73.93
45	Gordon Hotel	449.99
47	817 Fourteenth Street	251.00
48	1013 Fifteenth Street	120.00
48	do.	401.00
48	Gordon Hotel	4,892.44
48	1720 M Street	203.00
49	No address	501.00
49	do.	676.67
49	1015 Sixteenth Street	51.00
69	1617 O Street	70.00
74	901 Sixteenth Street	160.00
74	817 Fourteenth Street	250.00
74	1013 Fifteenth Street	151.00
74	1723 M Street	200.00
76	1023 Sixteenth Street	501.00
77	Square 145	233.33
93	1617 O Street	70.00
93	1439 K Street	115.03
93	1723 M Street	53.31
99	1015 Sixteenth Street	501.00
100	1023 Sixteenth Street	501.00

These items, with the Gordon Hotel item excepted, are not for office rent; they seem to be rent for individual residences.

There are a lot of scattered places. What they are I do not know. Now, here is another item, "Rent charge to Hugh J. Phillips for premises at the corner of Vermont Avenue

and L Street, \$800 a month." I do not pretend to say that I have found half of the rent items. This has been a very hasty examination on my part, but it seems that there are a number of places around town for which rent is being paid.

Here is an item that I can not pass over:

The Columbia Printing Company, Incorporated, applications for licenses, \$204.07.

Then:

The Columbia Printing Company, Incorporated, the Prussian system, \$551.50.

I do not know what the "Prussian system" is; I am in total ignorance on that question; but it seems to me that Congress ought to have some light on that important item.

Here are some other items:

Printing Hoover's supplement, \$757.15.

Publicity work, to W. D. Sheehan, \$160.

For writing manuscript, to Elizabeth Watson, \$900.

Truly, we have some valuable literary assistants in this department. It would be interesting to know the character of this particular article, whether it is one of the numerous eulogies penned regarding Mr. Hoover, which constantly emanate from his headquarters, or whether it was a dissertation upon "loking, or—well, just what it might be—\$900 for a manuscript!

Understand this is the people's money, and who cares how much of the people's money is spent? Have we not \$27,000,000 and more on hand, and have we not in another account \$2,000,000 on hand, and have we not a Congress that will give us \$1,750,000 without asking questions? Why not spend \$40,000 for buttons in one chunk? It is the people's money. Why not expend it, especially as the spender has probably never paid a dollar of taxes in the United States, and certainly has never voted here, for so he testified.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I recall, the Senator from Missouri and I occupied very much the same position on some of the details of the food-control bill when it was originally passed, and as passed the bill placed a certain work in Mr. Hoover's hands under rather limited powers. It placed him in a position where he was required to maintain a campaign of education. He was compelled to depend very largely on the voluntary cooperation of the American people, and went out in his work not only to educate the American people, but he went out for the purpose of arousing their interest and their cooperation. My observation in my own State has been that his agents have done this work in schools; they have done it by voluntary organizations, and have done it in such a way that the use of buttons such as are used in Red Cross work, the use of prizes, as in the case of the medallions, and the use of literature, such as that to which the Senator has referred, is really about the only purpose for which money could be expended to arouse public sentiment and toward crystallizing public sentiment. My observation has been that this campaign has been remarkably successful in securing the voluntary cooperation of the American people. Now, I should like to ask the Senator this question: Does he not think, under those circumstances, that to make a campaign and secure popular support of this work was rather better than to endow Mr. Hoover with power to enforce his views? He was compelled to arouse public cooperation, and how could he do it except by the methods which he has adopted?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, he was not compelled to do anything. That is the first answer that I make to the Senator. The next answer I make is that, if he saw fit to undertake to arouse public sentiment, that to arouse public sentiment by buying \$70,000 worth of furniture, to arouse public sentiment by paying a thousand dollars for this manuscript and \$900 for that manuscript, to arouse public sentiment by spending thousands of dollars for photographs, to arouse public sentiment by the reckless throwing away of the people's money is not justifiable, whether he had authority or did not have authority. Furthermore, as I have shown, through the corporation that he has organized he will take off in fees this year over \$12,000,000—forced fees.

The Senator says Mr. Hoover has no authority. I grant you he has no legal and proper authority, but, by the exercise of the power that we did give him—the power of licensing—he has so employed it that he has compelled every bushel of wheat in the United States to go through his hopper, and, as it goes through, he takes off 1 per cent of its value; and that figures over \$12,000,000. If he does not have power except to appeal to the consciences of the American people, then he is guilty of a usurpation to-day such as has never been witnessed in a free country since time was. He has undertaken to control the price of every farm product; and, if he has no authority, then by what right does he compel the millers of the country to engage themselves to pay to his corporation 1 per cent on

all the wheat they handle? If he has no authority, then by what right does he send out to the grocers of this town the command that they can not sell the citizen wheat flour unless at the same time he shall buy an equal amount of some other kind of cereal, whether he wants it or not?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator, if he will yield to me. I am interested in one statement the Senator has made, because I have had some correspondence in regard to it, and that is the power of Mr. Hoover to collect 1 cent a bushel on wheat that goes through his "hopper," as the Senator calls it. What becomes of that \$12,000,000 he collects, and what does he collect it for?

Mr. REED. I have asked the question; I can not answer it. But I am being drawn away from these items. I will come back to this particular item in a moment and I intend to be rather brief.

Here is another item:

Preparing pamphlets for publicity, to Mr. Judd, \$1,000.

Photo supplies, \$115.16.

Luncheons at the Lafayette Hotel, \$82.25.

Now, here are some items that are interesting:

Teaspoons, \$132.68.

Coffee urn and trays, \$48.25.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will yield, may I inquire if Mr. Hoover is running an eating house?

Mr. REED. I do not know, but this item looks like a restaurant (reading):

Steam table, \$488.38.

Electric range, \$100.31.

Hudson bicycles, \$60.

Car tickets, \$5.

Gold Medal flour, \$43.75.

Camera, \$147.83.

Flour and sugar to Corby Baking Co., \$44.49.

Now, let us see under what authority all this money was expended. I read the body of the act:

Be it enacted, etc., That by reason of the existence of a state of war, it is essential to the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, and for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, to assure an adequate supply and equitable distribution, and to facilitate the movement, of foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, and fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuels, hereafter in this act called necessities; to prevent, locally or generally, scarcity, monopolization—

And so forth. That is the authority. That was the business in which they were engaged. How do they, then, get this particular authority to use this money? Where do they find it?

I am going to read you from an address delivered by Julius H. Barnes, the president of this grain corporation, in a speech he made on January 17 at the La Salle Hotel, in Chicago.

Somebody sent me a manuscript of that speech. Mr. Barnes was a very large grain dealer, one of that class of men who were held up before the country when this bill was about to be passed as horrible examples of profiteers, of wicked men who gambled upon the boards of trade. I do not say Mr. Barnes was a gambler; but all men on boards of trade were classed together, and were held up before the country as objects of scorn, as wicked creatures who had to be controlled and put out of business; yet the Food Administrator's manly form had not settled securely in his chair of office until he called the biggest one of all these board of trade wheat dealers and put him at the head of the grain corporation. In every town that I know of he has selected the same class of men to be his representatives. In my own city the man who represents the Food Administration, who has been put in to boss the other members of the board of trade, is a man who would come within all of the denunciations that Mr. Hoover ever uttered except that of being a grain gambler. He belongs to that class of men whom Mr. Hoover denounced generally to the public. In the city of St. Louis Mr. Hoover is represented by a gentleman against whom I say nothing further than that he was "one of the chief of the sinners," if, indeed, they were sinners at all.

Mr. Barnes in the speech that he made on the food bill tells us where and how the Food Administration got its authority. I read:

And the food bill finally passed, declaring its purposes to be to prevent private control and establish public control of necessities—and then without a single effective weapon in it except an obscure clause which permitted voluntary agreements.

An obscure clause which permitted voluntary agreements:

And this bill, which came out of conference curtailed, robbed and shorn of its power, was the only bill on which we had to build, and almost in 48 hours a plan had to be constructed to take control of the wheat crop of America, and to so fairly control it that it could be apportioned not only to satisfy our needs but to discharge obligations to our allies which we were beginning to recognize as pressing and sacred. And it was only through the clause of voluntary agreements that any effective control was possible under the food bill as it passed; that we sought to create a price monopoly in this country by that weapon of voluntary agreements.

I am now answering the question of the Senator from Nebraska. Says Mr. Barnes, the president of this corporation, the right hand and sustainer and prop of Mr. Hoover: "It was only through voluntary agreements that they found the power to create a price monopoly."

When by enlisting so many of the mills with us, enlisting them to aid us by working under our direction, and, through the Grain Corporation securing in our hands the agreement of the allies that all of their needs should be provided through that channel—taking advantage of the fact that the embargo had shut the neutral from our market. It was on that basis that a public control was proposed of this most vital crop. And when we had established by voluntary agreements a practical monopoly the responsibility to make the price on the chief crop of America almost appalled us. Then a Price Commission was evolved and after considerable hesitation they recommended to the President of the United States that a fair price, all things considered, was \$2.20 per bushel.

I am glad Mr. Barnes made that speech. I am glad that he made it in that frank manner. With a frankness that is brutal—and I do not use the word in any harsh way toward Mr. Barnes—he tells the American Congress that when it passed this bill, it passed shorn of the powers they had wanted; that Congress brought it out of conference in such shape that they could not control the price. The fair inference from his words is that Congress did not intend to give them any such power. Then they hunted for a power, and they found we had given the power to make voluntary agreements, and they employed that power to make voluntary agreements for the purpose of fixing prices, which Congress never gave them and never intended to give them, and which Mr. Hoover, before the passage of the bill, testified he did not expect or want.

Time and time again, when Mr. Hoover was testifying upon the passage of the food-control bill, he solemnly assured the Agricultural Committee, and through it the Congress, that it was not intended to affect in any way the prices of the producer; that it was intended to be limited in its operation to the middleman; that it was the profiteer—the middleman—that he was after, and repeatedly he said: "There is no price fixing in this bill," and there was none.

But when the bill came out, Mr. Barnes and these keen men that had been called together from the boards of trade, these gentlemen who knew all about the habits of the bulls and the haunts of the bears, because they made their habitat with them and were of them, said "Behold: There is the power for voluntary agreements. That power to make voluntary agreements will distort so that we will be able through it to fix these farmers so that they will have no market." Everybody knows that if it were not for the law against voluntary agreements a few men could get together in a room in a short time, make a combination by voluntary agreement, and control the price of any article.

I now read a portion of the testimony Mr. Hoover gave when this bill was being urged for passage.

Mr. Hoover was delivering a lecture to the Agricultural Committee:

There are a number of current illusions about the legislation proposed. The first is the illusion in some quarters that the bill is directed against the producer.

Now, notice his language:

It would not be necessary to traverse this statement to anyone that had read the bill. It especially exempts the producer from every one of its provisions, with the exception of one section, and that is the provision for a guaranty; and this section is designed to entirely benefit and secure the producer.

That is the \$2 minimum guaranty for wheat—

The savings of the American consumer ought not and should not be made by a sacrifice on the part of the producer—

In other words, the saving to the American consumer should not be made by regulating the farmer's prices. That is what Mr. Hoover was telling the American farmer and the American Congress.

I read on:

They should be made by the exclusion of speculative profits from the handling of our foodstuffs.

Again, he said:

The second illusion is that there is price fixing by this bill. There is no provision for price fixing—

Now, notice—

and no such thing can be carried out under the bill.

Now, Mr. Hoover's chief apostle tells us that after this bill had been passed, its powers shorn and reduced, Mr. Hoover and his associates got together and they found that there was no price fixing in the bill; but he tells you in good, round terms that they discovered there was the power to make voluntary agreements and that these usurpers concluded they could employ the privilege of making voluntary agreements so as to establish monopoly prices, and that they set about doing it

immediately. Within 48 hours before the ink of the President's signature was dry, before the country had finished congratulating itself upon the low prices that the consumer was going to get and the high prices that the farmer was to receive, before the people of the cities had time to quit complimenting themselves upon the fact that a great savior had come who was going to give them cheap bread and cheap meat and give the farmers high prices, their new guardians, the reformed bulls and bears and Mr. Hoover, had conceived a plan by which they could corner the grain, control the markets of America, and fix prices to suit themselves.

Mr. President, there is such a thing as good faith. No man can ever afford to lay it aside. There is such a thing as a pledge of honor, and no man can afford to disregard such a pledge. If the power to fix prices had been written in this bill after the statement Mr. Hoover made, it seems to me he would have declined to enforce such a power, for he would have said, "I told the American people and the American Congress that no such power was in the bill, and I will not exercise it." But instead of taking that position, we find the man who told us there was no price fixing in the bill seated around the table in consultation with a lot of board-of-trade sharps—notice I do not say "sharks"; I say "sharps"—devising a plan to do the very thing their leader assured the people and Congress could not be done, and they are now extending that on to other articles and are further employing it to levy toll upon all wheat bought or sold.

This much of a digression I make for the benefit of that Senator who asked where the authority came from to collect the money, the \$12,000,000 that is coming out of the producer and the consumer alike in this country and that is going into the coffers of a corporation.

Now, notice another statement of Mr. Barnes. For its proper appreciation I beg to say by way of preliminary that the country was startled the other day when it was told by Mr. McAdoo that "Mr. Hoover was the sole purchasing agent for the allies." I stood on the floor of the Senate when this bill was being considered, and argued that a man who had recently come from England, where he had spent all of his grown-up life, ought not to be given this great power over our people, because he might have a natural bias and leaning and sympathy toward the country of his long-time adoption. Because I made that argument I was severely criticized, not only on the floor of the Senate but in the press of the country. It was said that I was appealing to prejudice. Let me at this point say that I never entertained prejudice against any man because he may have happened to be born in England, or because he happened to migrate to England, and lived there all of his grown-up life. I have no prejudice against any man because of that. But the point I sought to impress was this: When we were giving authority over our foodstuffs, that authority ought not to be vested in any man who might have a prejudice or might have a sympathy in favor of the country of his long-time residence.

But, Mr. President, many virtuous editors rose and denounced me for being personal. There was no personal feeling in it. I have no personal feeling now. Mr. Hoover means no more to me than a name and a principle that is involved and wrapped up in his present official conduct.

But now what are we told? We are told by the Secretary of the Treasury, the biggest man in the Cabinet, that Mr. Hoover is, in fact, the sole purchasing agent for the allies. Mr. Hoover does not deny the soft impeachment; and now comes his associate, Mr. Barnes, and tells us, in the language which I have just read, that—

Through the grain corporation we have secured into our hands the agreement of the allies that all of their needs shall be provided through that channel, taking advantage of the fact that the embargo had shut the neutral from our market. It was on that basis that a public control was proposed of this most vital crop.

So, Mr. President, you now have the fact admitted. I challenge the attention of every lawyer in the Senate, of every man who has ever sat upon a bench, and of every man who understands the rudiments of equity, to the fact that there is now established in this country an agency, a power, set up under our Government, which, by the distortion of the purpose of a law passed by Congress, has gained complete control of the farmer's market, and is able to fix the price upon every bushel of wheat that is raised in the United States—such being the declaration of Mr. Julius H. Barnes, such being the fact well known to those who have studied the case for a long time—and that that power which sets a price upon the wheat of the farmer in this country is at the same time the agent of foreign Governments and of foreign persons that are to be the purchasers of large quantities of that wheat.

I do not care, sir, whether or not we are in alliance with Great Britain and with France and with Italy—God bless them all—

their agents should not fix the price upon the products of American farms. Their representative should not be the master of the American farmer. They should not be the buyers and, through their agents, the sellers.

No man can serve two masters. Even if the American farmer is to have a price arbitrarily fixed upon his products; it ought to be fixed by a man who represents the American farmer alone, and he ought not to owe an allegiance, either by contract or otherwise, to foreign governments or to foreign merchants.

Mr. HITCHCOCK and Mr. LEWIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact well known to the Senator from Missouri that the foreign Governments were required to accept Mr. Hoover as their agent? Their agent was appointed by the President of the United States for the purpose of carrying out functions which the necessities of war compel us to perform in provisioning our allies on the other side. Is it not a fact that Mr. Hoover is not their agent selected by them, but their agent named by us, whom they are required to accept, and does not that entirely alter the situation?

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to ask me a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, Mr. President. I desire to invite the Senator's attention to the statement he has made as to France and Britain being the allies of the United States, and to ask him if he does not understand that there is really no such relation between France and the United States and Britain and the United States; that there is no alliance between the United States and Britain of any nature that would give Mr. Hoover, or any other agency whatsoever, the position of agent for the United States upon the theory that he was the agent of any member of an alliance with which France or Britain was connected? I beg to say to the Senator that, as I understand it, and must insist in behalf of my Government, there is no alliance between this country and Great Britain or France.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of course, I use the term "allies" in the sense in which we ordinarily use it. I do not know what our arrangements are with France and Great Britain technically; but I know that for all practical purposes we are at the present time fighting one war, and that in so far as that is concerned our interests are to a large extent the same. And so, without stopping to debate the technical phases of the question raised by the Senator from Illinois, and with that one word of explanation, I pass to the interrogatory of the Senator from Nebraska.

I do not know the facts to be as the interrogatory of the Senator from Nebraska appears to indicate. The statement made by Mr. McAdoo did not indicate that the President of the United States had said to Great Britain and our other allies that they must purchase their grain through Mr. Hoover's corporation. The statement contained in Mr. Barnes's speech, which I have just read, would not indicate that; and I question very seriously whether the President of the United States ever said to these foreign countries—our allies or our friends or our associates, by whatever name you may choose to call them—"You must buy through Mr. Hoover's corporation, and upon his terms."

On the contrary, I think Mr. Hoover's testimony which he gave before the Agricultural Committee before the bill was ever passed indicates that he was himself at that time most urgently insistent that the allies should have a single purchasing agent. I can quote the Senator that testimony or refer him to it as soon as I conclude. I do not have it on my desk at this moment.

It will be urged by some that we ought to furnish our grains to our allies as cheaply as they are furnished to our own people, the argument being that we are engaged in a common cause. But, Mr. President, if that is true, the obligation ought to be mutual.

If we are to furnish to our allies the things they need as cheaply as we furnish them to our own people, if we are to arbitrarily control the price of our products for their benefit, then there should be a reciprocal relation and the goods they produce and we need ought to be furnished to us at a regulated price, for if they be our allies then the relation is mutual. There is no more reason why we should sell our products at a controlled price and buy theirs at a war price than there is that they should buy ours at a war price and sell theirs at a controlled price. Examine the reports and find the enormous amount of goods we are buying from the allied countries every year and ask yourselves if we are buying at war prices and selling at controlled prices what the result must be.

Mr. President, at this point, although it is aside from the theme I am discussing, I want to put another matter before the country. A few days ago Mr. Hoover certified to us that the East was about to starve to death, and said it was because the railroads could not haul the grain. Mr. McAdoo said, "Tell me where your grain is and I will haul it." That ended the matter. Then a few days later the country was again told there was going to be an enormous wheat shortage; that we were confronting something like wheat starvation in this country. The impression was broadly given that so much of our wheat had been sent abroad that there was not enough left to feed our people, and the suggestion was made we would have to eat a great deal less than we ever had eaten.

I took occasion the other day to challenge those statements, although I had not had time then to examine the records. I now have the figures, and I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have more wheat in this country to-day than we had at this same period last year.

The wheat crop of 1916 was 636,318,000 bushels; of 1917, 650,828,000 bushels. That is to say, in 1917 we produced more wheat than we did in 1916 by 14,510,000 bushels. The wheat exported, both in the form of wheat and flour, from July 1, 1916, to March 1, 1917, was 135,000,000 bushels, and for the same period of time in 1917-18, 120,000,000 bushels. In other words, we shipped abroad 15,000,000 bushels less in 1917 than we did for the same period of time in 1916, whereas our crop was 14,510,000 bushels greater, so that we have in round numbers 30,000,000 bushels more wheat in this country to-day than we had at this same period last year.

Why, then, should these alarming reports be sent out to the country? Why should the people be told they are about to starve to death? Why should they be told one day that they are going to starve to death because there are not any cars and then when that statement is refuted, why should a statement be made to the country that leads the people to understand that the wheat has been shipped out of the country when, as a matter of fact, we are 30,000,000 bushels better off to-day than we were during this period one year ago?

It is difficult to understand why statements of this kind are made. It is difficult to understand what motive can inspire any man to put forth declarations of this sort. If the railroads had been under private control and the statement had been made by Mr. Hoover that was made, all the railroad presidents in the world might have made solemn affidavits that they were ready to move the wheat, this country would have believed that Mr. Hoover was correct in his statement when he said that there were not any cars to move the wheat. But it happened that William G. McAdoo was in control of the railroads and he spoke as one having authority, not as these mere scribes, the former presidents of railroads, and when he said there were cars the people took his word for it.

Then we were told that for some mysterious reason we were going to starve to death any way. I have answered that from the figures.

Mr. President, I have only a word or two more to say. If you will look through these reports of the Food Administration you will find the most astounding salary list. When we examined Mr. Hoover before the sugar-investigating committee the question was asked about the salary of Mr. Allen, whom he brought here. Mr. Hoover stated that he was receiving \$200 a month, my recollection is, for expenses, but I find in looking at this book that he is a \$4,800 a year salaried man. I find there are men drawing salaries of \$5,000 here and similar amounts in various cities and towns of the United States. Some of these men work for the corporation; some of them, perhaps, work for the general organizations; but it is in fact all one, and the expenses first or last come from the American public.

My attention has been called to a telegram from London. I want to read a little of it. It quotes from Edmund Burke, of Peek Bros. & Winch (Ltd.), of London, England.

This food control is partly a folly, partly a sham, but it is altogether a crime against the public, and especially the poor. I say it has raised prices. I say it has hoarded stocks. I say it has created artificial as well as real scarcity. I say it has profiteered. In addition to the excessive food taxes so unwisely levied by Parliament, it has imposed charges on food which amount to illicit taxation. I say it has wasted public money. I affirm, and about this there will be no dispute, that it has been a blundering, ineffective, and costly administration.

Such is the result in England. We here pursue the same foolish way, but employ agents and methods much more foolish than any Englishman could produce if he tried. The English are lacking in the necessary imagination.

I desire to print the whole article in the Record as a part of my remarks. I apply a part of it to this Food Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

BRITISH FOOD CONTROL DECLARED A FAILURE—LEADING WHOLESALER ATTACKS GOVERNMENT POLICY—EDMUND BURKE, OF PECK BROS. & WINCH, CRITICIZES SYSTEM AS BEING "A CRIME AGAINST THE PUBLIC"—CLAIMS IT HAS HOARDED STOCKS AND ENCOURAGED PROFITEERING—CALLS ADMINISTRATION "BLUNDERING AND COSTLY."

LONDON, February 1.

Sharp criticism of the food-control system was made by Edmund Burke, of Peck Bros. & Winch (Ltd.), dealers in wholesale groceries, at the annual meeting of the company. He declared that the people were "all toads under the oppression of a well-meaning Government, and that food control was a crime against the public."

Mr. Burke said:

"This food control is partly a folly, partly a sham, but it is altogether a crime against the public and especially the poor. I say it has raised prices. I say it has hoarded stocks. I say it has created artificial as well as real scarcity. I say it has profiteered. In addition to the excessive food taxes so unwisely levied by Parliament it has imposed charges on food which amount to illicit taxation. I say it has wasted public money. I affirm, and about this there will be no dispute, that it has been a blundering, ineffective, and costly administration."

SAYS GOVERNMENT MEANS WELL.

"We are all toads under the oppression of a well-meaning Government. Some of the toads have expressed to me their doubts even of the alleged good intent, but there is no doubt about the oppression. In the midst of war abroad the Government is making war upon trade at home. It has restricted our imports and exports."

"That may be necessary. It does not apply to cement for Holland, but then we deal in foodstuffs—not in goods of the cement class. We don't even touch Government cheese. But they have gone further than this. They have curtailed and impeded the distribution of food to our people at home. They may not have intended it, but that is the effect of what they have done. Perhaps you have heard that there is a food controller. He appears to have a good press agent, who keeps him prominently in the limelight."

"Well, I am not going to utter one word against Lord Rhondda personally. He is a well-intentioned peer, who is trying to feed the people on printed forms. But he is struggling with an impossible task, and working with impossible tools. He is in the hands of officials picked up in the Temple, the clubs, and placed in control of great trades requiring technical knowledge and experience, of which they are utterly destitute. Lord Rhondda himself knows everything about coal and little or nothing about food. That is why they made him, not coal controller, but food controller."

INVITES OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION.

"Well, now, I am going to state some plain facts about his department. It is time that the public knew the whole truth about it, and if one of our M. P.'s will move for a committee of the House to investigate its working I will undertake to offer some very startling evidence. I am speaking with full deliberation, but with full knowledge and with a deep sense of responsibility which I do not even ask my colleagues to share. I am prepared to substantiate everything that I feel it my duty to say."

"I could keep you here all day telling you funny stories—and tragic stories, too—of this control folly. But I will only mention as an instance one article in which we deal and with which you have probably had painful experience. You know something about the sugar-card fiasco and you have felt the pinch of the sugar famine. Perhaps you do not know that we are not allowed to import sugar, but we may bring in American chewing gum, and we do. You may have heard of sugar queues, of poor women waiting in the cold street while their unguarded children burned to death at home. But you may not know that during recent months this precious Government department was hoarding up sugar by thousands of tons and gorging the warehouses with twice the stocks they contained a year ago."

BLAMES CONDITIONS ON RED TAPE.

"I say nothing about tea except that want of shipping is not accountable for the shortage, and that the Government is compelling us to pay prices which are 25 to 50 per cent too high, and giving us insufficient quantity at that. Tea ought to be 4d. to 6d. per pound cheaper to-day. Remove their control, allow freedom of import and of sale, and tea will fall by that amount at least. Transfer the duty to some luxury which only the rich consume, and the retail price of tea will be cheapened by 50 per cent for the poor."

"Now, why have I troubled you with all these statements about food control? In the first place, because I want to take this opportunity of repudiating the calumnies that interested persons have set afloat as to traders generally and as to the small retail grocer in particular. I want to repudiate on his behalf the charges of unscrupulous profiteering and hoarding that have been brought against him. He forms one of the most honorable, industrious, and at the present time, as has been proven, indispensable classes of the community."

"All the queues are preventable. Most of the scarcity is preventable. The whole of the red tape—the whole of the army of officials—might be scrapped to-morrow with advantage to the State. But they will not be scrapped because they have all snug berths. The danger is they will go on interfering with the food supply until we have little left to sell and the people have little left to eat. In that case one more noble lord will get a step in the peerage. But then there will be placed upon the stage a new act in this tragedy of food control—the stagnation of trade and the discontent of a disillusioned people."

Mr. REED. I want at this point to read a telegram which I have received from one of the leading newspaper men of California. This applies to the tomato question I discussed a few days ago. I hope there are some Senators from tomato States present:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., March 9, 1918.

Senator JAMES A. REED,
1956 Biltmore Street, Washington, D. C.:

Committee on coordination of purchases circulated order through Food Administration fixing basis of awards for tomato products for Army and Navy use at no higher than \$21 per ton for Maryland, Delaware, and other States; \$20 for New York and Michigan; \$18 for Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois; and \$15 for Western States. This order becomes

maximum price for tomatoes for all uses and manifestly places growers in Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, and Washington at mercy of California Packing Corporation, which alone packs 50 per cent of western pack. This corporation is represented by Charles Bentley on Hoover staff, who gets approximately \$15,000 salary from that corporation; J. K. Armsby, president of the corporation, is the head of the California preserved-food committee of Food Administration; another Armsby on staff at Washington. This corporation works with Libby packers. Prior to Bentley's order California canners were offering tonnage contracts at \$17.50 and \$18 per ton. This order enables Bentley's concern to buy from producer \$6 cheaper than Delaware canners. About two-thirds of entire western crop will be sold commercially and one-third to Government. See John Francis Neylan, of San Francisco, at Shoreham Hotel, representing California Tomato Growers' Association. He knows details regarding Bentley, Armsby, and prices.

F. W. KELLOGG.

This is the sort of thing that is going on, and the people are to pay for it. The price of California tomatoes is to be beaten down to \$15, and men on Mr. Hoover's staff are engaged in the packing business in California. When they come to sell their tomatoes, they will sell tomatoes that they bought at \$15 a ton as against tomatoes that the eastern canner bought at \$21 a ton. There is \$6 a ton difference in favor of the western packer who holds a job under Hoover. I can understand why men work at a dollar a year under those circumstances, and so can you understand it, and so the country is beginning to understand it.

There is another thing I am going to call attention to. The packers have been licensed. Senators, the food-control law would never have been passed if the country had understood that Mr. Hoover under this extraordinary grant of power was going to make the packers agree to not pay the farmer more than a certain specified price for their hogs and cattle and sheep. Never in the world would it have been passed.

How was it passed, I repeat? Mr. Hoover told us there was no price fixing in the bill. It was argued on the floor of the Senate that there was no price fixing in the bill. Those of us who declared that there were powers that might be employed for fixing prices were denounced, and yet I am about to submit to you that Mr. Hoover has fixed the prices upon the cattle and hogs of this country. He fixed the prices through the licensing clause. He fixed them through that distortion of the purpose of the bill which his agent boastfully stated was wrought out of an obscure clause not intended to give the power at all. It takes a highly educated board of trade conscience to state a thing of that kind boastfully. Here is a part of the letter that was produced in the Heney investigation. It seems that the packers have established a correspondence school. They have not learned the lesson of not committing too many things to paper. There is a Dr. Durand, of the Food Administration. Everybody who gets into one of these Government jobs down here immediately becomes a doctor. If a man would go out and catch a Kansas jack rabbit and bring it here and get it a job in any one of these administration bureaus, they would on the next day be addressing it as Dr. Jackabus. Doctors are more numerous in the Food Administration than colonels are in Kentucky. Dr. Durand has been the agent of the Food Administration in dealing with the packing-house situation. One of the letters that Mr. Heney produced is from Mr. White, of Armour & Co.

In part it reads as follows:

Under date of January 18, 1918, F. E. Wilhelm, of the Cudahy Co., was quoted as having written to the south side station of the Cudahy Packing Co. at Omaha relative to a meeting of representatives of Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy companies; that Dr. Durand, of the Food Administration, wanted to know the actual stocks of frozen beef in the country. He found, the letter said, that the amount was about 20,000,000 pounds.

The doctor then said that the letter stated that they were going to buy big quantities of beef every month—

I suppose this is a corporation that is going to buy—and he was skeptical about our being able to take care of the orders. He thought the quantity would be a minimum of 6,000,000 pounds a week. He asked for suggestions on how to provide this quantity. His first thought was to have a meatless week—

Mark you, this meat is to be bought to be shipped abroad, and bought through this monopoly company that is controlled and run and has its habitat with the Food Administration, and in order to get 6,000,000 pounds of meat the first suggestion was that we should shut off the American people's meat for one week.

When Freedom from her mountain height
Unfurled her standard to the air.

I read on:

His first thought was to have a meatless day, but was shown instantly that was impracticable, as there was no chance of us freezing our entire week's kill, and the effect of such a measure would be as bad, probably, as the present embargo on fuel.

How did we escape this calamity? The only reason why we are allowed to have meat in our stomachs for a week, regardless of our color, race, or previous condition of servitude or

health, was because the freezing plants of the packing houses would not quite take care of all the kill. I continue reading:

Mr. White, of Armour & Co., suggested that each packer freeze 10 per cent of his kill; and on this basis we should be able to secure 6,000,000 pounds of meat if the receipts ran as liberally as expected.

The letter said it was decided to try the plan.

Continuing the letter said:

"Dr. Durand said the situation would have to be handled in some way to avoid advancing the cattle market."

They were going to get this meat for shipment abroad, and they proposed to shut off all meat to the American consumer and have a meatless week; and, secondly, Dr. Durand rose up and said, in any event there should not be any advance to the farmers on this account. And so he continued:

"Dr. Durand said that the situation would have to be handled in some way to avoid advancing the cattle market; that that was the thing that absolutely must not come about; and if it did, he would take drastic measures to prevent it. He hinted that if it couldn't be worked out they would have to go into the question of closing up the branches—that where we had branches side by side that they would close at certain points.

"We are really on trial to see how we behave, and if we can take care of this export business without putting things out of condition in this country, all right."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED (continuing)—

"He hinted that if it could not be worked out they would have to go into the question of closing up the branches where we had branches side by side that they would close at certain points."

I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I wish to say to the Senator in this place that the Committee on Agriculture had before it this morning a farmer and a live-stock man from Illinois, and they submitted cost sheets showing the cattle bought by feeders last fall when the Food Administration was encouraging them to buy and feed and fatten cattle that were bought at 12 cents, then had been wintered and fattened on corn costing from \$1.50 to \$1.75 a bushel, and they have been sold at 12 cents, the feeders losing from \$42 to \$85 per head, making no allowance for labor or for overhead charges.

Mr. REED. Now, we have this situation: The open market for the sale of American cattle has been absolutely taken away—taken away by the Food Administration through the corporation it created. That corporation is at the same time the agent of European countries and merchants. It wants meat for its European clients and is willing to cut American citizens off from meat, but, above everything else, it is determined that the price shall not be advanced a single penny to its European clients. So these packing houses have at last found a master. They are told, "Advance the price at your peril." But unfortunately the man who is master of the packing houses is also master of 45,000,000 Americans engaged in agriculture, and he is likewise the master of all the consumers of this country, and he is the very efficient and effective agent of the English Government and of France and of Italy and of the neutral countries and of their merchants.

Mr. President, I repeat, one thing at least ought to be agreed upon, that if the price of the thing the American farmer raises is to be arbitrarily fixed, if he is to be denied access to the markets of the world, if the purposes of this bill are to be disregarded, and if new purposes and new powers are to be twisted and distorted out of an obscure passage—I quote the language of Mr. Barnes—if this is to be the way the American producer is to be treated, then, as a matter of common fairness, there ought to be the same kind of fixation of prices upon everything produced abroad. The producers of this country either ought to be allowed the markets of the world in which to sell, or those from whom we purchase ought to be compelled to sell in a controlled market.

If we do not produce an equality of market conditions the result will be that our allies will be trading us a small amount of goods for a large amount of goods; we will be worsted in every transaction, probably from 25 to 75 per cent; and when the war is over other countries will have all the money. I repeat—for I want it to be clearly understood—that the argument can not be made that because France and England and Italy with their soldiers are fighting on the same battle line as ourselves, therefore we must give them these trade advantages; because if they are our allies and we ought to give them trade advantages, then we are their allies and we are entitled to reciprocal advantages.

But we have no agent in France or in England or in Italy to fix the price upon the things they produce that are to be sent to America.

As is suggested to me by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], Mr. Hoover fixes the prices upon our exports, but nobody fixes the prices upon our imports. Ponder this question I am talking about; sit down and figure the amount of our ex-

ports; sit down and figure the amount of our imports and find out how much this country loses every year by regulating the price of all it ships abroad, and then buying in the open war market of the world all that it imports.

Speaking of the fact that Mr. Durand has had the packers on the carpet and has issued these orders, I apprehend the packers have not been greatly taken by surprise. I have an article here from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 28. The article states that Mr. Heney put into the record figures from the packers' books which show that men on Mr. Hoover's food board have been, and are still being, paid by certain packers. More than this, he showed that some have collected their pay in advance—some of the Government's "dollar-a-year men." Under the headline "Who's who and how much?" appears this:

Some of the Government's "dollar-a-year men" and the pay these men get from packing houses was recorded as follows:

B. B. Collins, assistant chief of the Division of Coordination of Purchases for Hoover; salary from Swift & Co., \$10,000 a year; pay collected to March 2, 1918; "special account," supposedly for expenses—

I am curious to know what farmer there is—what real, sure-enough farmer there is—down there in the Food Administration to watch Mr. Collins and see what Mr. Collins does. I should like to have a little coordination down there, in which the farmers of the country might be a part of the coordinators. I read on:

E. A. Heyl, member of Hoover board, on Libby, McNeill & Libby pay roll at \$9,600 a year; pay collected to February 16, 1918.

F. S. Brooks, member of Hoover board, formerly in charge of stockyard interests of Swift & Co., on pay roll at \$9,000 a year; credited on books for pay to March 2, 1918.

W. F. Priebe, head of the poultry and egg division, Hoover food board, on Priebe & Co. pay roll at \$275 a month, plus 25 per cent of profits after 7 per cent is paid on capital invested.

It was explained that Libby, McNeill & Libby and W. F. Priebe & Co. are both Swift & Co. subsidiaries or "departments"; so all four, in effect, are on the Swift & Co. pay roll.

Mr. President, there are cords of facts like these. Let me tell you what has been done—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator permit me to ask him what the men whose names he has just read receive from the Government of the United States?

Mr. REED. I do not know, but I have not the slightest doubt that they are "dollar-a-year" patriots, men who are literally pouring out their blood sitting down here on swivel chairs and fixing up jobs by which their present bosses get the best of every transaction between them and the American people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Perhaps they are pouring out their breath.

Mr. REED. No; they are pouring out their blood. A "dollar-a-year" patriot never sheds anything but blood. He may not shed much of it, but he would not be content if not credited with the loss of a little blood.

For years we fought against combinations that sought to control the price of cattle and swine. We denounced packing houses because they sought to establish monopoly control. We have had the packers indicted and tried and have undertaken to send them to the penitentiary. The country stood on tiptoe wanting them sent to the penitentiary. Why? Because the country believed they were fixing prices upon the meat products of this country.

Now comes one Herbert C. Hoover and proceeds to order them to fix a price, and to fix it so low that the farmer can not live. But what is the difference whether Herbert C. Hoover fixes the price or whether the packing houses by an illegal combination fix the price? The question is whether the price has been fixed at a point that will injure the American producer. It does not make any difference whose hand holds the knife; if it is driven through your heart, you die. It does not make any difference who fixes the price, whether it is done by a voluntary agreement of the packers meeting with each other for the purpose of increasing their profits or whether it is done by a voluntary agreement of the packers meeting with Herbert C. Hoover for the purpose of decreasing the prices to European clients of Mr. Hoover, if the price fixed is too low it is in either case equally ruinous.

Whenever you find working in the boards that fix the price the agents of the packing houses—their great and their responsible agents, their \$10,000 a year men—you may be very sure that the packing houses are not getting any of the worst of it. As the Senator from Oklahoma has very well said, so far as the farmer is concerned, they are ex parte prices.

But I go further. When we go to the grain business we find that the great grain dealers were brought in and that agreements were made with them that were satisfactory; at least they have been silenced, perhaps because they still get bigger commissions than they got before. The miller is called in; he is still permitted to grind the grain and is paid a bigger percentage than

he got before. Who is it that the reduction comes from, then? The reduction, if it occurs at all, comes from the farmer, the very man whom Mr. Hoover said in his testimony he did not propose to touch; the very man he said it was not his purpose to molest. I am almost tempted to stop and read that testimony once more, but I shall not do it.

When the bill was before Congress there was a great hurrah through the country about the wicked board of trade men. As I heard them described here by Senators, I would almost imagine that the gates of perdition had been opened and that a column of choice imps, with horns and tails and scales and brimstone rolling from their mouths, were marching forth, that each one of the vast army was a board of trade man. And that, confronting the on-rolling host, our great protector, our dauntless champion, killer of dragons, Hoover, stood, his burnished shield upraised, his lance poised, ready to drive the vicious horde into the flaming vortex from which they had come forth. But, sir, I beheld a different scene. I saw him selecting their captains and their lieutenants and their sergeants, picking them out carefully one by one, their leaders, taking them down to the food headquarters, and putting them in charge of the food supply of the "dear people" that he so much doth love. And now all over this country, in every market of the land, you find those men placed in command.

I do not denounce them; I do not say the things we were told of them were true; my experience has been that some of the men engaged in the grain business, just as in other businesses, are speculators, some are gamblers, but the great majority of them are simply plain dealers who buy and sell for commission and who are thoroughly honorable men. When this crusade was being worked up the man who dared say as much as I have said now would have been denounced as an enemy of the people and a friend of profiteers.

Mr. President, let me go a little further. We were told that there would be no effort, as I have said repeatedly—and I intend to keep on saying it as long as I have the power of protest—that there would be no effort to take away the farmer's market.

Some of the men who were denounced as profiteers were the millers. They were brought in and were consulted, and an agreement was made with them, as I showed you awhile ago, to pay them 1 per cent on every bushel of grain they handled, and to guarantee them against any loss; and that guarantee to the miller against loss is met out of the \$50,000,000 that the United States Government took of the people's money and turned over to capitalize this corporation. So wherever you go you find not only in this place, but you find in other boards in Washington, that the men whom the people believe have been mistreating them and profiteering are the men who are in charge and in control. We tried, as has been suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, to put a provision in the bill to prohibit that sort of thing, but its teeth were drawn.

I heard one of these gentlemen before the Military Affairs Committee solemnly swear that shoddy was the proper material with which to clothe American soldiers; that it was a better material for overcoats than the pure wool taken from the sheep's back. If he had said we were out of wool and we had to use this material, and if that had been true, I would have made no complaint, but he undertook to claim it was a superior article.

I saw men appear and heard them undertake to justify the expenditure of money where individuals who have only drawn a salary in the past of a couple of hundred dollars a month suddenly, when the taxpayers are to foot the bill, blossom into \$10,000 a year men. I see accounts where newspaper men, writers, who have been working for years at fifty or sixty dollars a week suddenly are worth \$12,000 a year; and when you inquire why they are employed, no one can explain what useful purpose they serve in the building of ships.

Mr. VARDAMAN. One of the Hog Island men, Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, had his salary raised from \$12,000 to \$25,000. That is the usual way the Hog Island patriot for perquisites has of showing his consuming love of country.

Mr. REED. Let me tell you there is a bottom to every barrel; there is an end to every fortune; there is a limit to the wealth that any nation can produce. The American people in some respects are the most conceited people in the world. They have fed themselves on their own adulation until they are drunk, I sometimes think, with conceit—and I say this, of course, kindly. We have talked about our bravery until there was a great American statesman who actually thought that we could raise an army of a million men overnight; and he was in perfect good faith. I am not sure but that I have indulged in some of that kind of nonsense myself in the past, but generally I limited it to the Fourth of July or thereabouts. [Laughter.]

One of the things that we have been teaching ourselves for the past three years is that we are the richest nation on earth and that we have so much money that there is no end to it. My brother Senators, let me say to you, that before this war is ended it may be determined by a slight turn of the balance. Clemenceau, the French premier, said the other day that the nation won in a war that could make itself think it was not beaten for a quarter of an hour after the other side realized it was beaten. Before this war is over, it may be that the balance will be determined by a few billion dollars—a very few—and therefore we should not waste money to-day.

We must pay two or three prices often in order to get things quickly. There may be justification in instances of that kind, but not a single dollar of our money should be unnecessarily expended; we should hoard it, because, after all, in one sense money is the lifeblood of this enterprise. We must keep our men upon the field; our expenses will mount higher and higher; we must create armaments and still greater armaments, and the expenditures will mount and mount beyond calculation. We must build ships and still more ships, and we must literally pave the bottom of the ocean, if something can not be done to suppress the submarine, with vessels that have cost us millions and millions of money and with the precious cargoes that represent even more of our toil and our money. We must care for the widows and for the orphans that are being made; we must support the old fathers and the old mothers whose sons are beginning to die; we must be prepared to meet the awful accumulation of sorrow and woe, and, as far as money will go, we must be ready to assuage the grief of these people; but, above everything and beyond everything, we must keep our land prosperous; we must keep its industries humming; we must keep its energies alive; we must keep its industrial thews strong, its arteries of commerce open, its great enginery of production at its very highest point, so that as we expend we shall also produce; and in everything we do, while we should be spendthrifts for the purpose of carrying on this war, we should be misers in the wasting of a single dollar.

So I say, when the Food Administration comes here to-day, admitting that it has a million and a quarter of dollars on hand; that it has \$29,000,000 in the treasury of its corporation; that it has a fund outside of that of an unknown amount; and that it has assets, that are supposed to be good, of almost \$2,000,000, at this time there should be no further grant.

The committee—and I say it with the utmost respect—have accepted, I believe, the mere report of the House, and, being engaged in other things, did not investigate this item. I may have spoken to deaf ears, but I believe, whether I speak successfully to-day or not, the time is coming when an accounting must be had, and I ask that the item go out of the bill.

Mr. REED subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks, as an addendum, the rule that has been promulgated by the Federal Food Administration for the District of Columbia specifying the things that people are to be permitted to purchase at grocery stores, quantities, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following rules and regulations have been promulgated by the United States Food Administration and went into effect Monday, January 28, 1918:

Special rules 23 to 32, inclusive, are promulgated for the purpose of assuring an adequate supply and equitable distribution of wheat flour for purposes essential to the national security and defense and to the successful prosecution of the war. Under existing conditions, the present unrestricted distribution of flour is deemed to be clearly an unjust, unreasonable, and wasteful practice.

Rule 23. No licensee shall sell, use, or deliver to any person any flour other than the grade generally known as "second clear" or "low grade" for any purpose other than the manufacture of human food.

(A) MILLERS.

RULE 24. The licensee manufacturing wheat flour shall distribute his output, not sold to the Government of the United States, to the Food Administration, or for export through his customary markets and channels of distribution, in such manner that each of his customers receives his fair share thereof, and that during the three-months period from February 1, 1918, to April 30, 1918, and from May 1, 1918, to July 31, 1918, no town, city, State, or district receives from the licensee's mill more than 70 per cent of the amount it received in the corresponding quarter of the year 1917. He shall not seek new markets or channels of distribution, and sales of large quantities to new customers will be regarded, *prima facie*, as a violation of this rule.

RULE 25. The licensee manufacturing wheat flour shall not on and after February 24, 1918, sell or deliver to any person engaged in the business of baking bread or rolls any wheat flour, except whole-wheat flour, unless the buyer purchases at the same time, or the licensee satisfies himself that the buyer has purchased 1 pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every 4 pounds of wheat flour purchased.

Wheat flour substitutes for the purpose of this rule and of rule 30 shall include bran, shorts, and middlings, corn flour, corn meal, edible cornstarch, hominy, corn grits, barley flour, rolled oats, oatmeal, rice, rice flour, potato flour, sweet-potato flour, buckwheat flour, cottonseed

flour, milo, kamfir, and feterita flours and meals, soya-bean flour, peanut flour, casava flour, taro flour, banana flour, and other products of a similar nature.

In making any combination sales under this rule, or rules 26, 29, 30, and 31, the licensee shall name a price for each of the articles so sold, which shall not represent more than a normal prewar profit on any one of such articles.

Rule 26. No licensee manufacturing wheat flour shall, without the permission of the United States Food Administrator, sell or deliver such wheat flour to any retailer or consumer thereof unless the buyer purchases at the same time or the licensee satisfies himself that the buyer has purchased 1 pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of wheat flour purchased.

Wheat-flour substitutes for the purposes of this rule and of rules 29 and 31 shall include hominy, corn grits, corn meal, corn flour, edible cornstarch, barley flour, rolled oats, oatmeal, rice, rice flour, buckwheat flour, potato flour, sweet-potato flour, soya-bean flour, and feterita flour and meal, or in case of whole wheat or graham flour containing at least 95 per cent of the entire wheat, six-tenths of a pound of wheat flour substitutes for every pound of such whole wheat or graham flour purchased.

(B) WHOLESALESALE AND JOBBERS.

RULE 27. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at wholesale shall not, without the written permission of the United States Food Administrator, purchase for delivery to him during the three months' periods from February 1 to April 30 and May 1 to July 31, in 1918, more than 70 per cent of his normal requirements of flour for such period. The amount of purchases made in the corresponding three months' periods in 1917 will be regarded as prima facie evidence of such normal requirements.

RULE 28. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at wholesale should distribute the 70 per cent of his requirements, purchased in accordance with rule 27, through his customary markets and channels of distribution in such manner that each of his customers receives his fair share thereof, and that during the three months' periods from February 1, 1918, to April 30, 1918, and from May 1, 1918, to July 31, 1918, no town, city, State, or district receives from the licensee more than 70 per cent of the amount it received in the corresponding three-months' period in the year 1917. He shall not seek new markets or channels of distribution, and sales of large quantities to new customers will be regarded prima facie as a violation of this rule.

RULE 29. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at wholesale shall not, without the written permission of the United States Food Administrator, sell or deliver such flour to any retailer or consumer unless the buyer purchases at the same time or the licensee satisfies himself that the buyer has purchased 1 pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of wheat flour purchased, or, in case of whole wheat or graham flour containing at least 95 per cent of the entire wheat, six-tenths of a pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of such whole wheat or graham flour purchased.

RULE 30. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at wholesale shall not, on and after February 24, 1918, sell to any person engaged in the business of baking bread or rolls any wheat flour, except whole wheat flour, unless the buyer purchases at the same time or the licensee satisfies himself that the buyer has purchased 1 pound of wheat flour substitutes for every 4 pounds of wheat flour purchased.

Note to rules 25, 26, 29, and 30.—A certificate from the buyer that he has purchased a given quantity and kind of wheat flour substitutes, not balanced by other purchases of wheat flour, may be accepted as satisfactory evidence of the facts stated.

(C) RETAILERS.

RULE 31. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at retail shall not without the written permission of the United States Food Administrator sell wheat flour to any person unless such person purchases from him at the same time 1 pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of wheat flour purchased, or in case of whole wheat or graham flour, containing at least 95 per cent of the entire wheat, six-tenths of a pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of such whole wheat or graham flour purchased.

RULE 32. The licensee dealing in wheat flour at retail should distribute the flour which he receives as equitably as possible among his customers in such manner that no one of such customers shall receive more than his fair share thereof. He shall not without the written permission of the United States Food Administrator sell to individual consumers residing in towns or cities in quantities in excess of one-eighth to one-quarter barrel, nor to any individual consumer in rural or farm communities in quantities in excess of one-quarter to one-half barrel.

NOTE.—All retailers, whether licensed or not, must, in selling wheat flour, and all consumers must, in buying wheat flour, conform to the foregoing regulations. That is, the retailer, whether licensed or not, shall not sell wheat flour to any person unless such person purchases from him at the same time one pound of wheat-flour substitute for every pound of wheat flour purchased, or in the case of whole wheat or graham flour containing at least 95 per cent of the entire wheat, six-tenths of a pound of wheat-flour substitutes for every pound of such whole wheat or graham flour purchased.

The substitutes for wheat flour are corn meal, cornstarch, corn flour, hominy, corn grits, barley flour, rice, rice flour, oat meal, rolled oats, buckwheat flour, potato flour, sweet-potato flour, soya-bean flour, and feterita flours and meals. Any substitute or combination of substitutes may be used.

CLARENCE R. WILSON,

Federal Food Administrator for the District of Columbia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I will only detain the Senate a few moments in stating the position of the committee in reference to this item. In the first place, the Senate should bear in mind that the Appropriations Committee, except under extraordinary circumstances, and then without the rule, does not recommend creative legislation. Its purpose is to comply with the law, not to make the law. It is not the part of an appropriations committee to determine whether a law is good or bad or whether the authorizations made by law should be expended or not; but when it finds that the Congress has enacted laws that require the expenditure of money, it is its duty to recommend the appropriation of the money for that purpose.

Now, so far as the Committee on Appropriations in this instance is concerned, up to this hour it has had nothing whatever to do with the Food or Fuel Administration, either in the enactment of the law or in the appropriation of money for its carrying on. The money that was spent by Mr. Hoover before the food-control bill was passed came from funds that the Congress had placed in the hands of the President of the United States without limitation, and if the President saw fit, in his wisdom, to turn it over to Mr. Hoover for expenditure, it was a matter for the President to determine, and not for ourselves.

As to the appropriation of the money that has been spent since the enactment of the food and fuel control law, it came from other sources than the Committee on Appropriations, and is the law of the land. On the 10th day of August, 1917, the Congress passed and the President approved an act "to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel." It is under that law, and under that law alone, that Mr. Hoover has secured his rights and his powers and the money that has been expended up to this time.

In the first place, this bill of August 10, 1917, appropriated \$150,000,000 to be turned over by the President to the head of the Food Administration for the purpose of conserving and controlling the wheat supply of the country. It also appropriated \$10,000,000 to authorize the purchase of nitrogen for the benefit of the farmers of the country. Neither of these items had anything to do with the appropriation that is contained in this bill. But there was a third item that has all to do with the item now under consideration, and if you will refer to section 18 of that enactment you will find that it reads as follows:

That the sum of \$2,500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until June 30, 1918, for the payment of such rent, the expense, including postage, of such printing and publications, the purchase of such material and equipment, and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as the President may deem essential.

It is under that clause in this bill that these powers were exercised. It is under that clause in this bill that this money has been expended. Now, I said some days ago that I recognized that in the first days of the war it was necessary for the Congress to pass speedy, sometimes ill-considered and unguarded legislation, and this bill was one of those measures. It came in the very inception of war, when Congress was under a strain to meet war conditions, and there may not have been the time at hand to carefully analyze, to point out the details, to put the safeguards in this measure to protect it; and the necessity for speed may have required the appropriation of money in the legislation itself instead of making the authorization and allowing the Appropriations Committee to handle the appropriation. But be that as it may, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has nothing to do with the law. It has no power to change the law, except by unanimous consent of the Senate. It is not the tribunal or the forum in which that question is tried. All we have to do is to take the law as it is; and when the departments estimate what is necessary to be expended to carry on the work, if the estimate comes within the terms of the law, it is our duty to report the appropriation.

Now, what does this say? Mark you, in the legislation under which we must operate there is no limitation. It says that this money is appropriated and these powers are given—

For the purpose of such rent; the expense, including postage, of such printing and publications; the purchase of such material and equipment; and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as the President may deem essential.

It does not say where the expenditure of money for postage and speeches and printing shall be made, nor is there any limitation fixed by law on that expenditure. The Congress has already granted this authority. It is an enactment of the law. The Congress makes no limitation on the number of persons employed. Under the terms of this act they can employ a million men.

Ordinarily I do not justify legislation of that kind. I say the time has come now, if Congress is going to legislate, when it should put in each bill the checks and balances necessary to protect the American people and to protect the Treasury of the United States. But you know and I know that this bill was passed under whip and spur. It was passed at a time when the Congress did not have the chance to pause and consider as it might do at this time; or, if it had the time to pause and consider, it did not pause and consider; and that is the law.

I shall not attempt to defend the expenditures to which the Senator from Missouri has referred. They were not authorized by the Appropriations Committee. They did not secure the money from that source. They were undoubtedly within the

law, and their continuation is within the law if the Congress cares to keep the law on the statute books. Really, as a matter of fact, the principal work of the Food Administration, so far as the expenditure of money is concerned, is in a propaganda to encourage the American people to do certain things that the Food Administrator deems necessary in order to conserve food products. The only question involved here is the question as to whether you are going to allow the law to be operative, or whether you are going to strangle it in an appropriation bill.

That is the only issue. This is the law. No man can deny the law. The organization is already perfected and working, and no man can deny that money is being expended along the lines of this organization, and honestly expended; because, whether Mr. Hoover has spent his money wisely or unwisely, he has certainly given the Congress of the United States a full and complete and ample statement of every dollar that he has expended.

I am not here to defend Mr. Hoover's expenditures. He is amply able to defend himself; and, more than that, I am not provided with the information to answer in defense. I never met Mr. Hoover but once, and that was many, many months ago. He has not been before the committee, and I am not prepared to give his reasons for the necessity of expending this money. The sole question before the Senate to-day is as to whether you are going to indirectly throttle the Food Administration by cutting off this appropriation, or whether you are going to make an appropriation that is within the terms of the statute as it is now provided by law. As a matter of fact, this has been duly, properly estimated for.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did not the committee investigate and determine how the money was spent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The House committee went into a full investigation of the matter, and reduced the estimate from \$2,000,000 to \$1,750,000; and as the Senate committee were satisfied with their work on the subject, they did not open it or change the item at all, and therefore, of course, made no further investigation. It is usual, where the Senate Appropriations Committee is satisfied with an item that the House has already worked through, not to reopen it, because if we reopen every House item we would never get through with our work.

The only question before the Senate is this: If the majority of the Senate of the United States think these appropriations are unwise, then they are unwise because the law is unwise. The proper way to go at it is to repeal the law, not to stop the appropriations. If a majority of the Senate are now dissatisfied with the Food and Fuel Administration law, then there is the regular and proper way to get it off the statute books—namely, by introducing a bill for its repeal. But if the law is on the statute books, properly there, and the proposed expenditures are within the terms of the bill, there was nothing else to do but for the Appropriations Committee to propose the authorized appropriation and allow the Senate to determine the question for itself. I myself believe that if you are going to continue the law you ought not to continue it in a way that will only create a deficit that must be paid some day in the future, but you ought to appropriate the money as you go along. If you do not want to continue the law, then repeal the law, but do not strike down the appropriation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me just say this:

While the law authorizes certain things to be done and has not placed a limit, of course Congress always has the right, when it comes to an appropriation, to limit the appropriation. That right of control never leaves Congress; and it does not follow that the whole Food Administration law should be stricken out if you do not give this \$1,750,000. It simply means that there would have to be some curtailment of expenses.

I am sure the Senator did not mean to state that so broadly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I was debating the matter from the standpoint of the Senator's motion. This is a deficit.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This money is appropriated for the expenditures that are needed between now and the 30th of June.

Mr. REED. I beg the Senator's pardon; the money, as I read it, is not a deficit at all. The Senator wants to get this right, as he does everything else, and I call his attention—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this money is appropriated for one year only, and that is the fiscal year 1918. That year ends on the 30th of June next, and that is the limitation on the item on page 4 relating to the Food Administration. So it is presented to us with an estimate, and the appropriation appropriates it, for the use of the Food and Fuel Administrators for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President. Here is the table. I call attention to the summary appearing in the House hearings on page 1152. The total appropriations are \$5,515,000. The disbursements are \$1,985,429.08. The incumbrances—which, as I have stated, and which the evidence shows, are obligations that have been incurred there—are \$2,272,383.22. The available balance is \$1,257,950.23.

Now, they have that available balance, as I read this testimony, to run them until the next appropriation bill. They may think that they want more. They may think that they want to continue this extravagant and wasteful use of money; but it does not at all follow that the Congress is obliged because it has passed this law to continue to authorize these expenditures. I grant you that when the expenditures have been incurred, if this is to meet past bills, we will have to pay them. This is not, according to the statement that I have before me, to meet past bills at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, I find that about the middle of page 1150 of the House hearings it seems to be made clear. The chairman said:

That evidently is without taking into the account the allotments that have been made by the President?

Mr. HOOPER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Because this would show a total of a little over \$3,000,000.

Mr. HOOPER. The expenditures up to January 31 are \$1,985,429.08 from all appropriations, in addition to which we have what we call incumbrances—that is, bills receivable, the continuation of our present rate of pay rolls, etc.—to carry us to the 30th of June on all appropriations, amounting to a further \$2,272,383.22.

I suppose the word "sum" should be put in there, although it is not in the text.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in addition to your \$1,985,429.08?

Mr. HUTTERTLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. That is the unexpended amount for the balance of the year?

Mr. HOOPER. That is based on the salary roll as at present, and on the present basis of all funds except the completion of buildings and foreign representation.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the \$1,985,429.08 represents more than salary expenditures?

Mr. HUTTERTLY. Oh, yes, sir; it represents purchase orders, traveling expenses, and all of our operations. It also includes \$334,104.99 of the cost of the buildings so far completed, out of a total of \$600,000 building allotment from the President.

Which clearly shows that there is a deficit—

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (continuing). That they are required to have additional money to run their establishment up to the 30th of June, and that this is not for additional money, but it is required to take care of the situation up to that time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator is too candid a man to want to have anything understood except absolutely what the facts are.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To be sure; but I have read the facts.

Mr. REED. And the Senator has misapprehended this testimony, as I think I can show him. Now, I ask him kindly to go back to the middle of the page, a little further back than he did, beginning at the middle of the page. I read this simply for the context:

The CHAIRMAN. If you can, I wish you would give the committee a summary of the financial situation under these appropriations.

Mr. HOOPER. We had total disbursements as of January 31 amounting to \$1,985,429.08.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that under both services?

Mr. HOOPER. That is under all of our operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The operations of both the Food and Fuel Administrations or just one administration?

Mr. HOOPER. For both administrations—the Food and Fuel Administrations.

The CHAIRMAN. That leaves an available balance of how much?

Mr. HOOPER. That leaves us an available balance under all appropriations of \$1,257,950.23.

To get the explanation of that will the Senator turn over the page to the bottom of page 1152? I call his attention to the summary of appropriations and allotments and to the next to the last item under the head of "Appropriations," which is \$5,515,000. Under the head of disbursements the total is \$1,985,429.08. That is what they have expended. Then comes the next item, which is incumbrances. That is \$2,272,383.22. There is all that they have expended and all they have bound themselves to expend; and it leaves that available balance of \$1,257,950.23 to run them to the end of the month of June, after taking care of all the expenses and of all of the incumbrances. Now, the question is, without any other evidence than that. Are we to give them a million and three-quarters more of money. I surely can not be mistaken in reading that. If I am, I want to be set right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator is mistaken, although I may not thoroughly grasp the situation from the figures to which he has called my attention.

Mr. REED. Let me state it again.

We gave them \$5,515,000. You will find that at the bottom of page 1152. They have disbursed \$1,985,429.08. They have in-

cumbrances—that is, they have incurred obligations—to the amount of \$2,272,383.22. The aggregate of those two things taken together, subtracted from the \$5,515,000, leaves on hand unexpended and unincumbered an available balance of \$1,237,950.23; and in the testimony you will find that the chairman, at the bottom of page 1150, asked this question, which elucidates the matter:

From the statement you have just handed to me it appears that you had a total appropriation for the Food and Fuel Administration of \$5,515,000; that out of that there has been an actual expenditure of \$1,985,429.08; that there are now obligations, or what are called here incumbrances, of \$2,272,383.22, leaving what you designate as an available balance—and what we frequently speak of as a free balance—of \$1,237,950.23.

Mr. HUTTERLY. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. That is predicated upon your existing organizations at the present time?

Mr. HUTTERLY. Yes, sir.

I think that makes it pretty plain that they have got that much money.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can very much better answer the Senator in Mr. Hoover's own words as to whether this money is called for as a deficiency under this bill; and, of course, it is a deficiency, because after the 30th of June they can not expend the money if we appropriate it in this bill. If it were a permanent appropriation that Mr. Hoover desires, he would have gone to the sundry civil bill, to carry it through next year. But he comes on this deficiency bill and the appropriation is limited. If he does not spend the money between now and the 30th of June, it goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. REED. I understand; but there will be no trouble about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator means there will be no trouble about his spending it?

Mr. REED. Not at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, then, he needs it; at least, he thinks he needs it.

Mr. REED. That is a different question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On page 1168, here is what Mr. Hoover said about these expenditures:

The CHAIRMAN. So what you must contemplate, assuming that you will need all of your available balance and all of your estimate of \$2,000,000, is an increase in expenditure of nearly 200 per cent?

Mr. HOOPER. We want to increase in the Food Administration our State expenditures about \$200,000 per month—that is, nearly a million dollars. There is also an implied expenditure by our organization here of half a million dollars in five months. My own estimates were about \$1,000,000 in five months in the States and an expenditure of about \$500,000 over and above our present rate of expenditures here, if we have to take transportation and those other problems. Now, Dr. Garfield comes along with a desire for a large expansion in the Fuel Administration, which we are not answering for.

In addition to that, let me say to the Senator that my understanding is that although this sum is lumped—the item contained in this bill under the Food and Fuel Administration headline—one-third of this appropriation goes to the Fuel Administrator.

Mr. REED. No; not that much.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the understanding.

Mr. REED. Of this particular item?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of this particular item. Our understanding is that one-third goes to the Fuel Administration and the other two-thirds goes to the Food Administration. So that reduces the proportion that Mr. Hoover would get under this appropriation to a little less than \$1,200,000.

Mr. REED. Now, coming back to that question we were discussing, since we are having this good-natured colloquy—as the Senator from Alabama and myself always can have—I think the Senator will now agree that the statement he has just made clearly shows that the money that is now asked is an additional appropriation in order to take care of a contemplated increase that Mr. Hoover proposes to make, because he says:

The CHAIRMAN. So what you must contemplate, assuming that you will need all of your available balance and all of your estimate of \$2,000,000, is an increase in expenditure of nearly 200 per cent.

Mr. HOOPER. We want to increase in the Food Administration our State expenditures about \$200,000 per month—that is, nearly a million dollars.

Then he goes on to state that there is also an implied expenditure, and so forth.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator about that. It is not all for an increase; but at least a part of the \$1,200,000 is for an increase—an expansion—not of new work, but of the work that he is already engaged in in the State administration.

Mr. REED. It is for the expansion of the work in the States, he tells us, and then an expansion in Dr. Garfield's department; but in both cases it is new expansion work. Therefore, the question we now want to settle is this: On this sort of showing, are we satisfied to give him this \$1,750,000 to be expended in extending and expanding the work that he has been doing in the past? If he has enough money now to con-

duct the part of the work that we think ought to be conducted, then we ought not to give him more money.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a question for the Senate to determine.

Mr. REED. I am trying to answer the Senator's argument; that is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The object of the committee was to report this appropriation when it came to us as a deficiency, and it was shown that the purpose of the deficiency was to carry out an authorization made by Congress.

Mr. REED. I will make just this one brief statement in reply: I am not criticizing this committee at all, and I have not criticized it in any way. I simply took this item. In the Senate committee it evidently had no investigation, and I do not criticize them for that, because I know the Senate committee can not go into every item that comes over from the House. But I have taken the trouble to look into these accounts and see the use to which our money has been put; and now the question is, Are we going to increase the million and a quarter that is already there and that they will have to run them until June, when the new appropriation will come, by \$1,750,000 in order to expand their activities? I am willing to submit the question in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARREN in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, which is to strike out the language of the House text on page 4, from line 9 to line 21, inclusive.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill? Can the Senator state whether the committee has been informed how many persons are employed by the Food Administration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; as I stated to the Senator from Missouri the Appropriations Committee of the Senate accepted the House item, as the investigation seemed to have been pretty thorough in the House on that subject. We merely accepted the House hearings and did not make an independent investigation of our own, as is done in many items. I do not think the House hearings disclosed the number of employees; at least I could not say with definiteness. It is long, and I could not run through it at this time, and I do not recall that it was given there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator know whether the employees are under the civil service, all of them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding is that the employees under the Food Administration, most of them, at any rate, are not under the civil service. It is my understanding that they are not civil-service employees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator know what this extension work in the States means? Apparently a million dollars of this appropriation is to be spent in that way. Does that mean more employees, or is it in printing and publicity work?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under the Food Administration act Mr. Hoover has or assumes that he has power to regulate prices to a certain extent and to control production, but he has no power to coerce saving, and under the law the only way he can accomplish that result is through a propaganda to encourage people from patriotic motives to save food supplies. My understanding is that the organizations in the States are largely along that line, although I think they operate to some extent along the other line. Mostly I think it is toward having public meetings, publications of information in the papers and pamphlets, and agents to go out and see the people to try and get them to put Food Administration cards in their windows, stating that they observe the recommendations of the Food Administration in reference to the conservation of food. I think it is along those lines that this money is being expended to a large extent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The information is rather indefinite. I suppose it can not be helped in these war times.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say candidly, although I did not rise for the purpose of defending Mr. Hoover, because I am not sufficiently informed to do so, I am not in touch with the administration and he has not seen fit to put before myself or the Senate committee any information on the subject; but so far as I am concerned I am not nearly as much opposed to the use of money to encourage people through patriotism to save and support the Government as I am to those laws which seek to use the strong arm and force the people of the United States to do things which may not be necessary.

When the people of the United States, in response to their patriotism, which has been aided by propaganda of Mr. Hoover, see fit to say we will have meatless days and wheatless days, that is only a response to patriotism, no one forces it upon them, and I think that is really good work. I do not know but it is the best work that is being done in the war. It certainly does not curtail the liberty of any citizen of the United

States. When a man does without his food in order to encourage the soldiers on the battle line it seems to me that more soldiers are likely to go to the front.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not out of sympathy with one of the purposes just referred to by the Senator from Alabama, namely, the encouragement of the citizens of this country to bring about saving in order that more wheat or flour may be sent across the ocean. I can not agree, however, as to meatless days, for they have done a very grave injury to the production of live stock in the United States and we are not saving any meat for our allies.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the question asked by the Senator as to the number of employees in the Food Administration, I will state that the only testimony that was given was given by Mr. Hoover before the House committee. He does not give the number of employees, but states the amount that was paid monthly for salaries in Washington, and that amounts to \$185,000 per month, roughly speaking, as testified to by Mr. Hoover.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is in Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. In Washington.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator know approximately the average salary?

Mr. SMOOT. No; if I did, I could tell the number of employees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will wait until next year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have not recklessly criticized the Food Administration, because I have known very little about it and have wished for its success. I have had, however, very many complaints both against the food department and the fuel department. All Senators have had the same experience, and it seems to me that these complaints have been sufficient to have induced the Committee on Appropriations to scrutinize very carefully this particular appropriation. Such scrutiny was due to both the Government and the administrations.

I do not wish to pose as a critic, and yet when the committee itself says it did not look into the matter at all, but accepted the work of the House committee, which it appears did not investigate the matter very extensively, either, I feel as though I am justified in stating that the Senate has not been furnished with the information it ought to have on this important question.

I am convinced by the colloquy between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that this is not in the proper sense a deficiency need. The appropriation is not necessary for the operation of food control. It does not affect the existence or the usefulness of the Food or Fuel Administration. Money sufficient has been appropriated to meet the demands that were estimated for at the time the original bill was passed. There is over a million dollars on hand now, and the testimony shows that amount to be quite enough to carry out the work of the administration as originally planned. Its obligations have been met. Its work is unimpeded by lack of funds.

I would not vote at this time to interfere with the efficiency of the Food Administration, many as have been the complaints made against it, because I feel that there was need for something to be done, and I am not ready to condemn it unqualifiedly; but I do not think it is quite fair to present at this time a proposition in the nature of a deficiency appropriation which is not such in fact.

There is no deficiency in the Food and Fuel Departments today, and there will be none by June 30 next unless enlarged plans are adopted before the end of the year, and unless I know more than the committee seems to know about those plans I can not vote this nearly \$2,000,000.

I rose simply to say that I do not wish to be understood as voting against the Food Administration, and in voting against this appropriation I do not regard myself as voting against the proper administration of that department. I can not, however, force myself to vote for an appropriation under the guise of an emergency or deficiency which is not that. Before Congress enlarges its plans for food and fuel control we should be quite sure that what has been done has been beneficial and that the additional millions of appropriations are to be used for the good of our country and its cause. The committee should have obtained and presented information to the Senate before it asked for this misnamed deficiency appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to strike out

the paragraph of the bill on page 4 from line 9 to line 21, inclusive.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which has come since the bill was reported to the Senate and which was not before the committee, but I have consulted the chairman about it and it is of such importance that I think it ought to be called to the attention of the Senate. On page 21 there is an item carried which reads:

For the control of malaria, cerebrospinal meningitis, and other communicable diseases in the areas adjoining military and naval reservations, and for the control of venereal infections, in order properly to safeguard the health of the military forces, including personal services, \$500,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1919.

That was placed in the bill by the House, but since the committee reported the bill I have been informed by the Public Health Service that some of the main trouble in reference to this health situation is not around the camps and cantonments but is at Government reservations and Government works where the laborers are living, because of the congested condition of the population and the health conditions surrounding them that need this work to be done, if anything more so, around the public works, shipbuilding, and nitrate plants, and other plants of that kind, than even at the cantonments.

Therefore I move to amend the section by inserting the following amendments, which I send to the desk. I ask the Secretary to read the first amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, line 21, after the word "reservations," insert "and on or adjoining other Government reservations or works for the protection of the civil population," so as to read:

For the control of malaria, cerebrospinal meningitis, and other communicable diseases in the areas adjoining military and naval reservations and on or adjoining other Government reservations or works for the protection of the civil population—

And so forth.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether this is to be followed by an amendment increasing the appropriation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. I intend to ask, at the suggestion of the bureau, for an additional appropriation of \$25,000. It does not largely increase it, nevertheless they say that it will be necessary.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not very large. I am astonished that they were so modest, because I have never found a department or bureau of the Government that thought money enough was appropriated to do anything. My own judgment is that there is money enough appropriated in the bill to accomplish the result, but, as the addition is so slight, I am not going to object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They stated that \$25,000 was the minimum sum that they could get along with, and I accepted the minimum sum instead of the maximum.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is absolutely impossible for them to know that fact. They can not know it. The Senator will agree with me on that point. It is a guess at best.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator, but I realize that in the great shipbuilding and nitrate plants and other public works it is just as necessary, and more so, to protect the health of the community and keep the workmen there as it is in the cantonments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I agree with the Senator on that point; but the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who keeps better informed than I possibly can do on the matter of appropriations, says that \$500,000 is appropriated in the bill already for that purpose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is \$500,000 appropriated, but they think it requires an additional amount.

Mr. GALLINGER. Twenty-five thousand dollars, of course, is negligible; and yet I think it is an absurd addition to a \$500,000 appropriation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am inclined to agree with the Senator about that. I think it is important for \$25,000 to protect the health of the civil population that must be around the work that must go on at the shipbuilding and nitrate plants and the other great industries. If the Government is going to prepare for war, I do not think we can hesitate on an appropriation of \$25,000 when it looks like we are going to spend \$25,000,000,000 before we get through.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that I think most of the money appropriated ought to be spent other than the places enumerated in the bill, for which \$500,000 is appropriated. In my opinion, the most of the money should be spent for preventing diseases at the places enumerated in the Senator's amendment, rather than those that are enumerated in the bill.

It does seem to me that an outrageously large amount was appropriated in the House; perhaps it is now intended to take half the money appropriated by the House and use it for the purposes specified in this amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not say as to that; but they do say that \$25,000 is the minimum they can get along with, and it is very small in comparison with the balance. I think it is the part of wisdom to let them have it.

Mr. SMOOT. They could get along with \$500,000 by just adopting the amendment already offered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Possibly that is true, but I do not think we ought to take chances on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have another amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, on the same page, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$528,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Since the bill was reported to the Senate I have had a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury asking for an increase in the appropriation for the Public Health Service. On page 20, line 22, I move to strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000." The Secretary of the Treasury has explained it by saying it has become necessary to open additional wards in many hospitals in order to take care of men at the military posts of the United States. I present it from that point of view. It is not perhaps very regular, but I think we ought to give this additional amount. I move to amend by increasing it to \$30,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear where the Senator wanted to insert the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, line 22, strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

For fuel, light and water, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 96, after line 12, insert:

Assistance to Senators: For an additional clerk for each Senator for the period of the war and six months thereafter, which is hereby authorized, at the rate of \$1,500 per annum, from April 1 to June 30, 1918, \$36,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think an arrangement will be made for all necessary clerks. Surely this is not the proper place for it, and I am surprised that the Senator should offer it. The chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses sent to me to-day an amendment to increase the contingent fund in order to provide for increased expenditures; but surely we ought not to be expected to take up the matter of additional clerks to Senators on this bill. It is not a deficiency in any sense.

Mr. CALDER. I regret that the Senator is surprised at my offering the amendment. I have looked carefully through the pending bill and I find that appropriations are authorized aggregating over \$5,000,000 for additional clerk hire and other employees in the different departments of the Government. Mr. President, I pay out of my own pocket for the services of two clerks, and a number of other Senators also employ such additional clerks. Not only that, Mr. President, but some Senators are permitted to pay their clerks higher salaries than are others. I am allowed \$2,000 a year for my first clerk, while most Senators—two-thirds of them, in fact—are allowed \$2,200 for their first clerks. I am allowed \$1,200 for my second clerk, while some other Senators are allowed \$1,440. So it seems to me that when department heads can come here and ask and Congress authorize additional funds to pay for their necessary clerks Senators have a perfect right to do likewise.

The work in my office has doubled. It is impossible for me to keep abreast of it without this additional help. I do not know how many other Senators are in the same position, but I know many are. If the Senate is not disposed to appropriate for clerks for all Senators, at least some provision should be made for help for those Senators who need it. I know that it is unusual to offer an amendment of this kind to this bill, but it seems to me the situation is unusual. I hope that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], will not object to the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have not the slightest idea that if this amendment is adopted by the Senate it can be maintained in conference. I am satisfied the Senator is injuring the very object which he has in view. I told him there was a

plan on foot—that the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses has a resolution attempting to provide for this matter. Whether or not he can do it I do not know, but it is certainly more appropriate to be provided for in that way than on this bill. The Senate may make any disposition of this matter that it sees fit. I do not desire to combat the amendment; on the contrary, I am anxious to meet the views of Senators like the Senator from New York in a fair, equitable way and in the proper place, but if he wants to inject it here in a way which I think is improper he can do it, and the Senate can do as it sees fit.

Mr. CALDER. Do I understand the Senator from Virginia to say that a movement is in contemplation to provide for the clerks for Senators who need them?

Mr. MARTIN. The chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses has a plan to increase the contingent fund of the Senate in order to enable this difficulty to be bridged over. He showed me a resolution which he was going to offer. Whether he will succeed in it, of course, I can not guarantee, but I believe there is a general disposition to give relief where it is really necessary. If, however, the Senator from New York wants to put it on this bill it is up to the Senate; I have nothing to say about it one way or the other. I have no idea, however, of being able to sustain it in conference.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question before he sits down.

Mr. CALDER. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask what number of clerks the Senator from New York now has?

Mr. CALDER. I have five.

Mr. THOMAS. That is two more than I have.

Mr. CALDER. I am allowed but three clerks, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, and I am paying for two others out of my own pocket.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, my inquiry had reference to the Senator's official force.

Mr. CALDER. I am allowed three clerks, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this question must be met before very long, and I think that it ought to be met by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. There has been trouble in the past when we legislated to authorize a new clerk for any particular committee, that perhaps in three months the Senator holding that committee chairmanship would be given another committee, a change would be made in the chairmanship, and some other Senator who would not require the number of clerks that the former Senator required would succeed him and have more clerks provided than he needed, while a Senator who really did need the clerks could not have them. I know the Senator from New York represents a constituency of nearly 10,000,000 people.

Mr. CALDER. Eleven million. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New York says his constituency consists of 11,000,000 people. His mail must necessarily be larger than that of Senators from most of the other States. Another thing, he lives close to Washington, and he has naturally numerous calls from his constituents, where other Senators have but few. The Senator from New York has discussed this matter with me several times as a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

I will say to the Senator that the reason there has been no action taken in his case is that up to about three weeks ago it was understood that there was to be some policy adopted in reference to this matter, but evidently that has been abandoned. I now suggest to the Senator from New York that he introduce a resolution and have it referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, asking for an additional clerk, or for two additional clerks, if they are absolutely necessary. That committee will meet and will agree upon some policy which is to be hereafter pursued.

I myself think that almost all Senators, when it is understood that we are going to grant additional clerks other than those provided for in the legislative appropriation bill, will ask for additional assistance.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield, as I understand the situation the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have not now the money, but, of course, an additional sum will have to be appropriated for the use of that committee before any plan can be adopted. I am rather inclined to think that the Senator from Utah is entirely correct, and that it would be better to take the form that he has suggested, that a sum of money be appropriated by the Appropriations Committee for the use of the Contingent Expenses Committee of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will yield to me a moment, I desire to say that I do not believe in doing business in that way, in appropriating money for the contingent fund, and then taking that money to pay clerk hire. I think we ought to fight this matter straight from the shoulder, if we are going to fight it at all. The place to introduce the amendment, I will suggest to the Senator from Utah, is on the legislative bill, which will be here next week. Such amendment does not belong on a deficiency bill, because there is no deficiency. If, however, we are going to change our policy, the legislative bill is the place on which to put such an amendment. If the Senator will offer an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative bill and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations, I assure him that every member of the committee will be glad to give it consideration. I repeat, however, it does not belong on this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course, whenever such an appropriation is provided for in the legislative appropriation bill, it goes to the committees and not to an individual Senator. I have sometimes thought it would be better to make a direct authorization of certain clerks to certain Senators, and not to the committees themselves. I think the matter will have to be worked out in some such way.

In relation to the appropriation the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] speaks of, that will have to be taken care of, and that can be taken care of in the next deficiency bill. I will say to the Senator that we shall have three or four more of them, in my opinion, before the session closes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from my examination of the matter, if the Senator will permit me, I think that is the only way it can possibly be arranged, from what I know of the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, that there is perhaps now an amount sufficient in the contingent fund of the Senate to take care of a few such cases until the next deficiency bill comes, but not very many cases I will say.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Utah that I introduced an amendment yesterday, which I expect to propose to the legislative appropriation bill, changing to a certain extent the manner in which we have been making these appropriations and providing that appropriations shall go to clerks for Senators in certain cases rather than to insignificant committees, as we have provided heretofore. It does not probably fully cover the situation of the Senator from New York, however, because it simply treats all Senators alike.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that the Senator from New York is in the condition which he says he is, and I know that, with the three clerks which he has and with the amount of business which comes to him, particularly during this war time, it is impossible for him to properly attend to his correspondence.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that at least one of the so-called three clerks of the Senator is a messenger.

Mr. CALDER. He is called a messenger, but I have no messenger. In my office the messenger is a stenographer.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand he takes the place of the messenger who is assigned in the case of certain committees.

Mr. CALDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in bringing this question up to-day I am not only speaking for myself, but for other Senators from the larger States. I venture the statement that at least 20 Members of this body are employing clerks and paying for them themselves. That is unjust; it is not right. Provision should be made for the payment of such clerks. If the Secretary of War wants additional clerks we do not ask him to pay for them out of his own pocket, nor do we ask any other executive department to do so; nor should Senators be asked to pay for their clerical help themselves. Those of us who come from the larger States have unusual demands upon us in war times, and particularly those of us who come from near-by States. The State which I have the honor in part to represent has as large a population as 19 of the smaller States put together, and it is unreasonable that we should not have the necessary help.

I am not going to insist upon the amendment, Mr. President, but I am going to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, before the legislative appropriation bill is reported, to

give me an opportunity to appear before his committee and discuss this question with the committee, in the hope that we can arrive at some basis of settlement of this matter which will be fair to all. I now withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator will certainly have that opportunity. I will send for him when the bill comes before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York withdraw the amendment?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to offer an amendment, and ask that it be read. I will then make a very short statement regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 78, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

INDIAN SERVICE.

For support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, in addition to the general and specific appropriations made for that purpose in the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stats. L., pp. 969-993), the sum of \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to prevent the closing of said schools or the creation of deficiencies in appropriations because of the increased cost of supplies to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the operation of the act of September 7, 1916 (35 Stats. L., p. 741), limiting annual expenditures for support and education of pupils in Indian schools to \$200 per capita, is hereby suspended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended upon improvements or used to increase the compensation of employees.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it will be recalled that some two or three hours ago the Senate disagreed to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations proposing to strike out that portion of the bill comprehended within line 21, on page 78, down to and including line 17, on page 79. This amendment does not propose to change the amount carried by that amendment, either by way of increase or decrease, but simply is a draft of the provision on the same subject reported in the Indian appropriation bill. I have been advised by the Interior Department that the House text is not appropriate for the purpose contemplated. I simply wish to have agreed to the provision as reported in the Indian appropriation bill. So my motion is to strike out all commencing in line 21, on page 78, down to and including line 17, on page 79, and insert that which the Secretary has read.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, it is entirely agreeable to me for the language now in the bill to be stricken out and the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to be inserted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. I notice that about the only difference between the amendment now suggested by the Senator from Arizona and the amendment which the Senate adopted to-day is that the amendment just presented leaves out this language:

In which case the Secretary of the Interior may authorize a per capita expenditure not to exceed \$225.

That is in cases where there are 100 pupils or over. Did the Senator intend to eliminate that part of the provision which has already been adopted?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; so that there will be no limitation whatever on the expenditure of this money. There is a general limitation; but so far as this money is concerned, it is desired that there shall be no limitation. That is the essential, prime difference between the House text and the provision as reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. I noticed that that was the difference.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the difference.

Mr. SMOOT. And I asked the question whether the Senator really intended that, because in all of the appropriations that have been made for the Indian schools that specific proviso has been included, whereas the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arizona would allow an unlimited amount to be expended upon each pupil. For instance, instead of \$225 they could spend \$500 on each pupil under his amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me, that is quite true; but in some places—for instance, the school at Sherman and at another place in California, and the one at Mount Pleasant—the price of staples has increased 100 per cent. I think that only in a few instances, if at all, will they exceed the limitation, but I do not believe the limitation ought to be placed upon this appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN. I am perfectly willing that the language we adopted this morning shall be stricken out and that the Senator's amendment shall be inserted in lieu of it; but, of course, it must be understood that it will be scrutinized in conference, for we have had no opportunity to scrutinize it here on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the fact that the amendment on page 78, beginning in line 21, has already been rejected, which, of course, has the effect of leaving in the bill the House provision. It will be necessary, therefore, to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN. It will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected, and I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia to reconsider the vote by which the Senate rejected the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations to strike out on page 78, beginning in line 21, down to and including line 17, on page 79.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment reported by the committee to strike out the language referred to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona proposing to insert the language read by the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$9,117 to be paid to Katherine Macdonald, of Butte, Mont., for and on account of unpaid claims held by her on account of work and services performed on or supplies furnished for the construction of the Corbett Tunnel, a part of the Shoshone reclamation project, in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. MARTIN. I make the point of order against the amendment that it has not been estimated for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

During the present emergency, upon request made by the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, there may be imported into the United States, without payment of duty thereon, raw materials, parts or partly fabricated parts of equipment and finished equipment required to hasten the production of munitions or machinery of war, or other necessary war supplies, whenever such duty would otherwise be payable directly or indirectly from appropriations for the support of the Army.

Mr. MARTIN. Why not make a point of order on the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not do that until the bill gets to the Senate, as the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. So I merely reserve the right to make a point of order on the amendment when the bill reaches the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from the Senator in charge of the bill concerning the item on page 96, beginning on line 10:

To pay John P. Hustung and Mary Hustung, heirs at law of Hon. Paul O. Hustung, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, \$7,500.

I have never opposed a provision of this character, but it seems to me this is rather an unusual one. I know the amendment has been agreed to in Committee of the Whole but before making objection to it in the Senate I want to inquire if this is not a most unusual way of inserting a provision of this kind?

Mr. MARTIN. It is the usual way, just exactly as it has been done in other cases in the Senate.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, when I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations we always refused to appropriate money for the benefit of a Member's heirs. Where he left a widow or children, dependent sisters or a mother, no objection was raised; but this is the first instance within my recollection in which Congress has ever appropriated any money for a Member or Senator's heirs at law.

Mr. MARTIN. It has been done frequently. Of course, those cases do not happen so frequently as those where there are widows and children, but it has been the custom to appropriate it to the next of kin.

Mr. CALDER. May I inquire if these persons are the father and mother?

Mr. SMOOT. They are the father and mother of the Senator.

Mr. CALDER. If that is so, Mr. President, of course I have no objection; but that ought to be stated in the bill. I do not

believe we ought to go into the business of appropriating money for the heirs of Senators unless they are immediate relatives.

I might add that the House Committee on Appropriations several years ago refused to provide the \$7,500 benefit for the son of Sereno E. Payne. When it was discovered that he had dependent sisters we voted it for their benefit, but we would not give it to the Representative's son. If the man whose name appears here is an adult son or a brother, I would oppose the appropriation under all circumstances; but if these persons are the father and mother, and they were in any way dependent upon the late Senator, that is a different matter.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am not willing to state about that, because I do not know.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I asked the question if these were the father and mother of the late Senator Hustung, and was told that they were, and I think that is absolutely correct. I understand that his father and mother were here visiting him just before he left to go home at the close of the last session of Congress; and I will say to the Senator that I am quite sure these are his father and mother.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is not so unusual as some Senators seem to think. One of the recent cases that comes to my mind is in connection with the death of the late Senator Burleigh, of Maine. His wife died a little while before he did, and we made the usual appropriation for the children of the Senator. There was no objection at that time; and I think there have been other cases of a similar nature.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, we have often provided this benefit for the children of Representatives or Senators, and, as I have already stated, on the occasion of the death of the late Representative Payne we appropriated it for the benefit of his sisters; but if the people mentioned in this provision of the bill are not near relatives—if they are cousins or distant relatives—then it is a mistake for the Senate to go into the business of providing for the benefit of distant relatives.

Mr. MARTIN. These certainly are not distant relatives. I do not know whether they are the father and mother or the brother and sister.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think they are the brother and sister.

Mr. MARTIN. That was my impression.

Mr. THOMAS. John P. Hustung is the brother of the deceased and Mary Hustung is the sister. If this is not allowed, surely we should not make the appropriation for the widow of the late Senator Brady, who does not need it. I think they should both be allowed.

Mr. CALDER. I bring the matter to the attention of the Senate because I think we are going pretty far afield if we appropriate money to heirs at law of Senators. If they are immediate relatives, I have no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. We have done it frequently for brothers and sisters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still in the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in, with the exception of the one reserved by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the amendments are concurred in I want to say a single word.

When the Senate had before it the amendment proposed by the committee giving authority for taking over the docks and wharves formerly occupied by the ships of two German corporations, I did not take the time of the Senate to utter a single word, because I took it for granted that the amendment would be adopted; but before it is concurred in I want to say that I have been utterly unable to see any reason why we should make that expenditure, especially in view of the fact that nobody knows how many millions of dollars it will involve. The Government now has possession of those docks, having commandeered them; it has the full use of them during the war; and I have been unable to see why the Government should hold them after the close of the war. However, that is an accomplished fact; and I simply want to put myself on record as having been opposed in committee to that provision, and not having changed my mind regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, with the exception of the one reserved.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment on page 20 after line 8; and let me say just a word as to why I do so.

After the amendment was adopted, while the bill was in the Committee of the Whole, I secured a copy of it, and I found that it provides that whenever duties would otherwise be payable directly or indirectly from appropriations for the support of the Army, they should be remitted. That means, Mr. President, that if any company that has a contract to-day with the Government of the United States and imports goods into this country that would enter into the making of articles contracted for, they would be admitted into this country free of duty. That would relieve many of the contractors of the payment of millions of dollars, and as they have already bid upon the goods, and contracts have been made based upon the payment of the duty, it would enable contractors to make an additional profit equal to the amount of duty remitted. If it were not for that there would be some propriety in asking for the amendment. Again, Mr. President, I think the House would take exception to the Senate undertaking, on an appropriation bill, to amend the revenue laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think the point of order ought to be sustained. I have no objection to its being sustained, and would like to have the item go out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the section goes out.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Tuesday, March 12, 1918) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our Heavenly Father, we lift up our hearts to Thee in gratitude for the genius of our Republic, handed down by our fathers and held sacred through all the vicissitudes of the past; for the great and fundamental principles in the Constitution of the United States, the embodiment of all that is sacred to our hearts—life, liberty, justice, fair play, and equal rights for all men.

We are now engaged in a gigantic struggle, not for conquest, not for gain, but in defense of those sacred rights. Unite us as a people, guide us by Thy counsels, and give victory to our arms, not only for ourselves but for the sake of all lovers of liberty, that a peace at last shall be established which shall make inviolate these sacred truths, and all praise be Thine, through Him, who disclosed the truth which makes all men free. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TAXES ON INCOMES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, the third reading of which has been ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the reading of the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the demand for the reading of the engrossed bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following motion to recommit and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TINKHAM moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to report the same forthwith with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"That in the interpretation and construction of this act the following rules shall be observed, namely:

"First. The term 'real estate' as herein used shall be construed to include lands, buildings, parts of buildings, houses, dwellings, apartments, rooms, suites of rooms, and every improvement and structure whatsoever, and every portion and part thereof, situated and being in the District of Columbia, and any and all estates and rights therein or thereto.

"Second. The word 'party' or 'person' shall include individuals, legal representatives of individuals, partnerships, joint-stock companies, associations, corporations, societies, bodies corporate, the Government of the United States in all its branches, departments, bureaus, boards, councils, and other agencies and instrumentalities, and all representatives, agencies, bodies, and instrumentalities acting for or in behalf of or employed or used by any and all foreign Governments not at war with

the United States, unless such construction would be unreasonable; and the reference to any officer shall include any person authorized by law, or by regulation made in accordance with this act, to perform the duties of his office.

"Third. Words importing the singular number shall be held to include the plural, and vice versa, except where such construction would be unreasonable.

"Fourth. Words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include all genders, except where such construction would be unreasonable.

"Fifth. The term 'rent' or 'rent from real estate' shall include any and all amounts received for the daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, or other periodical or term use or occupancy of real estate, or any part or multiple of any such periods of time.

"Sec. 2. That in addition to other taxes imposed by law there is hereby levied and shall be assessed, collected, and paid to the District of Columbia an annual tax of 100 per cent upon so much of the income from real estate of every person, whether resident or nonresident of said District, received from and after July 1, 1918, as exceeds the deductions herein allowed. For the purpose of ascertaining the amount of income subject to said tax there shall be deducted from the gross income reported as herein provided so much thereof as equals the lawful rent fixed and determined by the President or the rent income tax administrator, to be appointed as hereinafter provided, for the use and occupation of any real estate situated in the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 3. That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a rent income tax administrator, who shall be a citizen of the United States and a resident of the District of Columbia, who shall have full power and authority, and whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the President, to revise existing rents of real estate in the District of Columbia, and, by appropriate orders or rules, to fix the amounts of rents which it shall be lawful to charge, collect, and receive from real estate in the District of Columbia, which rents shall be uniform in so far as they apply to like pieces or parcels of real estate.

"Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of the rent income tax administrator, on or before the 1st day of July, 1918, by specific order designating the real estate to be affected thereby, or by general order affecting groups or classes of pieces or parcels of real estate, to fix the amount of rent which it shall be lawful for the party entitled to charge, collect, and receive for all real estate situated in the District of Columbia then or thereafter rented, leased, subleased, used, or occupied by any party or person: *Provided*, That the President, in his discretion, may extend the time within which the rent income tax administrator shall so fix the amount of lawful rents for said real estate: *And provided further*, That any party in interest may prosecute an appeal from any order of the rent income tax administrator to the board of rent income tax appeals provided for in this act, under and in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be made respecting appeals; and until such appeal shall be decided by the board of rent income tax appeals the order of the rent income tax administrator, in so far as it affects the property described in the appeal, shall be superseded by the appeal.

"Sec. 5. That from and after the promulgation of the order of the rent income tax administrator fixing the lawful amounts of rents of real estate in the District of Columbia, as provided in section 4, it shall be unlawful and be a violation of this act for any person to charge or receive a greater rent than the amount so fixed.

"Sec. 6. That the President and the rent income tax administrator, under the direction of the President, are hereby authorized to make and promulgate such orders, rules, and regulations not inconsistent with this act as may be necessary or appropriate effectively to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a board of rent income tax appeals consisting of three persons, who shall be citizens of the United States and residents of the District of Columbia. Said board of rent income tax appeals shall have the power to hear and determine any appeal from any order of the rent income tax administrator authorized by this act, and said board of rent income tax appeals shall have power, upon consideration of such appeal, by its order, to affirm or reverse the order of the rent income tax administrator, and in case of reversal thereof to increase, diminish, or otherwise modify the amount of rent fixed in the order of the rent income tax administrator, and the amount so fixed in the order of the board of rent income tax appeals shall be the amount of rent which can be lawfully charged and received for the use and occupation of the real estate affected thereby until the same shall be, upon new facts or other conditions, again changed and fixed by order of the rent income tax administrator or the board of rent income tax appeals, as the case may be: *Provided*, That no such further change shall be made within six months.

"Sec. 8. That on or before the 1st day of July, 1919, a true and accurate return, under oath, shall be made by every person subject to said tax, or his authorized agent, to the rent income tax administrator, setting forth the gross amount of such income from all separate sources accrued during the period from July 1, 1918, to and including June 30, 1919, and the deductions to which he may be entitled under this act, and the said taxes thereon, computed as provided in section 2, shall become due and collectible on or before September 1, 1919, and annually as hereinafter provided. If any person subject to said tax fails to make such return at the time herein fixed or makes a false return, the rent income tax administrator shall make the return from his own knowledge from such information as he can obtain, through testimony or otherwise, and the return so made shall be sufficient for all the purposes of this act. And to the amount of the tax due upon the returns so made by the rent income tax administrator there shall be added a penalty of 20 per cent of the tax, but when it shall appear that the failure to file the return or the making of a false return was due to an unavoidable or excusable cause the said penalty may be abated by the income tax administrator. It shall be the duty of the said rent income tax administrator to prepare and furnish to each taxpayer making application therefor printed forms upon which such returns shall be made. Said tax and all penalties thereon shall be payable to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia on or before September 1, 1919, and annually thereafter so long as this act shall remain in force.

"Sec. 9. Every person who shall charge, collect, or receive rent of any real estate in the District of Columbia without having paid the tax herein provided for when the same shall be due shall, besides being liable for the payment of said tax, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of not more than \$1,000.

"Sec. 10. That any person who shall contract for, collect, or receive a greater rent for any real estate than that fixed by order of the President or of the rent income tax administrator, or, in case of appeal, by the board of rent income tax appeals, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 for each offense; and this shall apply to sublessors and assignees of tenancies as well as to the original lessors.

"SEC. 11. This act shall remain in full force and effect for all purposes until one year after a treaty of peace between the Imperial German Government and the United States shall have been concluded: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of collecting taxes and penalties accrued before the conclusion of such peace, this act shall remain in force until the same are collected or enforced."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion to recommit on the ground that it is not germane, and that it fixes a rent commission, which is foreign to the original bill. I do not know how familiar the Chair is with the original bill, but I will say for his information that in the original bill there is no provision for anyone to fix rents. I ask the Chair to distinguish between the provision in the original bill which authorizes the assessor of the District of Columbia to fix values upon real property, and that a tax is then fixed on those values, but there is nothing in the original bill which fixes rent.

In section 4 of the proposed substitute which the gentleman has just offered I find this language:

That it shall be the duty of the rent-income tax administrator on or before the 1st day of July, 1918, by specific order designating the real estate to be affected thereby, or by general order affecting groups or classes of pieces or parcels of real estate, to fix the amount of rent which it shall be lawful for the party to charge.

I say that is absolutely foreign to the bill. There is no provision in the original bill for fixing rents. There is a basis laid down upon which income taxes are to be charged, but nowhere in the bill is there anything said about fixing rents. That of itself, without going into the other parts of the motion, make it subject to the point of order.

I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that this provides for a commission, and again I ask that the Chair bear in mind that the original bill does not fix rents, and that the proposed amendment or substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts provides for a commission to fix rents when, to repeat again, nothing of that sort is in the original bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do. The bill offered by the honorable Representative from Kentucky seeks to fix rents in the District of Columbia and then to levy a tax upon all excesses. He attempts to do that in this way: That rents in the District of Columbia shall be fixed as of September 30, 1916, and 10 per cent advance, and that any excess of those rents shall be paid to the District treasury. That is the bare provision and principle of his bill. The provisions of my substitute merely differ from his bill in the following particular: I establish as he does a tax of 100 per cent of an excess over what may be fixed by a rent commissioner. I establish a rent commissioner who shall say what the rental shall be, and then anything in excess of what he fixes shall be paid at the same rate in the same manner and to the same place as in the bill of the honorable Representative from Kentucky. In other words, his bill is a tax measure upon its face and, he claims, in principle; and the bill which I offer is a tax measure on its face and in principle, but with a commissioner fixing the rental instead of the rental being fixed as of a certain date, a change merely in the machinery for obtaining the same result. Therefore, it is germane.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] desire to be heard?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House, or even the time of the Speaker if he has resolved that this substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is in order. I rise to make an argument that the motion to recommit as submitted is not subject to the point of order as advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. I predicate that position upon the fact that the bill under consideration, the Johnson-Mapes bill, is a bill, according to its very title, to prevent extortion, and the whole scope of that bill provides the machinery by which extortion on the part of owners of real estate in the District can be checked. It not only provides the machinery in one way to control and check it by resorting to the taxing power and levying 100 per cent additional taxes on incomes above those received on or before a prior date, but it goes further and in section 5 provides a criminal penalty for any person to charge higher than the rate as fixed in his income-tax return. There are two ideas in the bill that carry out the idea of preventing extortion: First, levying a maximum amount of 100 per cent and confiscating all of the additional returns that have accrued from rentals since a certain date. Second, under section 5 it provides—

That all leases, contracts, and agreements, expressed or implied, providing for the payment of any large amount of money, or at a higher rate than that fixed by the deduction herein allowed, for the use or occupancy of any real estate are hereby declared to be contrary to public policy and unenforceable.

Now, what does the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts provide? There is no question whatsoever that it was within the authority of the House, and even now, to offer an amendment reducing the amount of tax that might be represented by these excess charges. That could be done, and there could be no question of the germaneness of such an amendment; that instead of levying 100 per cent, with a reduction of 10 per cent, as provided in the bill, there should be levied a tax of 75 per cent, which might be claimed was sufficient to deter these profiteers from exacting these excessive charges. But the gentleman from Massachusetts in his amendment provides another means of determining what should be the excess of charge. It does not say absolutely that it should be 75 per cent, 90 per cent, or 100 per cent, less 10 per cent, but it provides that there shall be a levy of 100 per cent on excesses of what represents a reasonable rental value, which will be determined by a board. Now, the subject matter of this matter before the House is to prevent exorbitant charges of rent—

Mr. COX. Rule!

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that remark—to prevent extortionate charges of rent by the profiteers in the District. The gentleman from Kentucky provides one method; the gentleman from Massachusetts provides another. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully contend that this is quite on all fours with the decision of a former Speaker, when we had up for consideration the determination of a proposal to establish the Isthmian Canal. That precedent is found in section 5909 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5:

To a bill providing for an interoceanic canal, specifying a certain route, an amendment providing for another route was held to be germane.

The main subject of that bill was the establishment of an interoceanic canal. The bill as introduced prescribed one route. It was held by the Speaker that the designation of another route was germane. So here in this matter before the House to-day, though the bill provides one method of levying the tax, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts offers another method of determining the tax. Both are taxation measures, both with penalizing sections to check profiteering. I also direct the Chair's attention to a citation which is the foundation, I take it, of all the decisions of all Speakers on the question of germaneness, as found in Hinds' Precedents, section 5825, the noted decision of former Speaker Carlisle, where he lays down the fundamentals which should guide presiding officers in construing what should be germane and what should not be germane. He used this general language, which should be a guide for Speakers for all time in determining the question of germaneness:

When, therefore, it is objected that a proposed amendment is not in order because it is not germane, the meaning of the objection is simply that it (the proposed amendment) is a motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration. This is a test of admissibility prescribed by the express language of the rule; and if the Chair, upon an examination of the bill under consideration and the proposed amendment, shall be of the opinion that they do not relate to the same subject, he is bound to sustain the objection and exclude the objection, subject, of course, to the revisory power of the Committee of the Whole on appeal.

The question before the Speaker is whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is related, is akin to the subject as contained in the Johnson bill. Why, the Speaker will have to go pretty far in holding that it is not related, because the Tinkham bill is a taxation measure providing for 100 per cent of the income and the only difference is how this additional income is to be determined. The gentleman from Kentucky directs that the income shall be determined absolutely by taking the return as the standard. The gentleman from Massachusetts determines that the 100 per cent shall be determined by first ascertaining what is a reasonable rent for this property. I well remember the position that the Speaker took when he was a Member on the floor that this motion to recommit should not be prostituted by allowing some Member to rise and move a motion to recommit without instructions; that recognition should be given to some Member in opposition to a bill to move to recommit with directions, so as to give the House on a record vote an opportunity for them to express their judgment as to the respective questions in dispute.

True, the House can not be privileged to vote on something foreign and not related to the matter, but the House should always be privileged to have the opportunity to vote on something that is akin. Otherwise, if you adopt a different rule you make the committee that reports the bill the master of the actions of the House in determining what legislation should be enacted. This House may be inclined, and undoubtedly is, to stop this profiteering, but it may be opposed to the method of confiscation provided by the bill offered by the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. But some opportunity should be given to provide for reaching these profiteers by a method akin to it, by saying the excess income over that previously charged above a reasonable rental and to be determined by a board, should be that which should be levied, rather than the arbitrary standard as fixed in the Johnson bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. In just one minute.

Mr. Fitzgerald, in a noted decision from the Speaker's chair, said that in order to determine the question of germaneness the question is whether it is related, whether it is akin, to the matter before the House. The question is whether the mere change in the machinery for determining what is a reasonable rent on which this income tax should be levied is not related to the standard as fixed in the Johnson bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that on page 424 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, the Chair sustained the very point of order which the gentleman now refers to?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread that decision and know the facts. What were the facts in that case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It says the amendment was excluded. That is the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Every decision of a Speaker on a question submitted to him must be determined according to the facts as presented for decision. What were the facts in that case? A deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration. It happened to contain an item making an appropriation for the support of the Government Printing Office, and if my memory serves me—I have not read the decision for more than a year—some person offered to establish the salary of the Public Printer on an item relating to the general maintenance of the Government Printing Office, and Speaker Carlisle naturally ruled that the question of the salary of the Public Printer was not related to the question providing for the maintenance of the Government Printing Office, which did not have anything to do with the question of the salaries of the employees.

I wish to make one further brief remark. The question is entirely different from the questions that were submitted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill as submitted there had no relation to the taxation feature at all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware of that.

On the 8th of May, 1913, in the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, there was a battle royal in this House on a question very much like this one. It was on a motion to recommit the Underwood tariff bill. At the request of the Chair the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] furnished the Chair in advance of their motion to recommit, and it gave me ample time to investigate the matter. I did investigate it thoroughly and conscientiously. The question involved was whether they could hitch a tariff commission onto the bill. The proponents, Mr. MANN and Mr. PAYNE, upheld their side, as always, with a great deal of force and ability. The opposition was led by Mr. UNDERWOOD, who made the point of order against its germaneness. The opinion delivered covers three or four pages and was carefully prepared. I am not going to read it now, but I would advise all the Members of the House who take any interest in the parliamentary points to read it. The Chair sustained the point of order, because it was setting up a new kind of a machine that had nothing to do with the bill. Now, in this present case the Chair is not going to pass upon any of these points that are being raised and is not going to talk about them. There is one proposition in this motion to recommit that compels the Speaker in light of the precedents to hold this point of order well taken, and that is the bringing up of this administration feature, of the tax commission, a great machine, and all that.

The point of order is sustained. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky and Mr. MANN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 101, answered "present" 6, not voting 99, as follows:

YEAS—222.

Alexander	Barkley	Brand	Caraway
Almon	Barnhart	Brodbeck	Carlisle
Anderson	Beakes	Browne	Carter, Okla.
Ashbrook	Beshlin	Burnett	Cary
Aswell	Bland	Butler	Church
Austin	Blanton	Byrnes, S. C.	Classon
Ayres	Borland	Byrns, Tenn.	Claypool
Baer	Bowers	Candler, Miss.	Collier

Connally, Tex.	Hadley	Loneragan	Shackleford
Connelly, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Lundeen	Shallenberger
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamlin	Lunn	Sherley
Cooper, Wis.	Harrison, Miss.	Magee	Sherwood
Cox	Hastings	Mansfield	Shouse
Crosser	Haugen	Mapes	Sims
Dale, N. Y.	Hawley	Martin	Sinnott
Dale, Vt.	Hayden	Mays	Sloan
Davidson	Hellin	Miller, Wash.	Smith, Idaho
Decker	Helm	Moon	Smith, Mich.
Denton	Heverling	Morgan	Smith, C. B.
Dewalt	Hensley	Neely	Smith, T. F.
Dickinson	Hillard	Nelson	Steagall
Dill	Holland	Nicholls, S. C.	Stedman
Dillon	Houston	Nichols, Mich.	Steele
Dixon	Howard	Nolan	Stephens, Miss.
Dominick	Huddleston	Norton	Sterling, Pa.
Doolittle	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Stiness
Doremus	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver, Ala.	Summers
Dowell	Humphreys	Oliver, N. Y.	Sweet
Drane	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Tague
Emerson	Ireland	Overmyer	Taylor, Ark.
Esch	Jacoway	Overstreet	Taylor, Colo.
Estopinal	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Thomas
Evans	Jones, Tex.	Park	Thompson
Farr	Kearns	Price	Tillman
Ferris	Keating	Purnell	Timberlake
Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Venable
Fisher	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey	Vestal
Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Vinson
Fordney	Kettner	Ramseyer	Volgt
Foster	Key, Ohio	Rankin	Walton
Freeman	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Watkins
French	King	Reavys	Weaver
Fuller, Ill.	Kinkaid	Reed	Webb
Gallagher	Kitchin	Robbins	Welling
Gandy	Knutson	Roberts	Welty
Gard	La Follette	Robinson	Whaley
Garrett, Tenn.	Langley	Romjue	Wheeler
Garrett, Tex.	Larsen	Rouse	Wilson, Ill.
Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	Rubey	Wingo
Good	Lea, Cal.	Rucker	Wood, Ind.
Goodwin, Ark.	Lesher	Russell	Woods, Iowa
Gordon	Lever	Sabath	Wright
Graham, Ill.	Linthicum	Sanders, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Gray, Ala.	Littlepage	Saunders, Va.	Young, Tex.
Greene, Vt.	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa	
Gregg	London	Sells	

NAYS—101.

Bacharach	Frear	Mason	Snell
Blackmon	Garner	Meeker	Snook
Britten	Gillett	Merritt	Stafford
Buchanan	Glynn	Montague	Steenerson
Burroughs	Gray, N. J.	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Ill.
Caldwell	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Strong
Campbell, Kans.	Greene, Mass.	Mott	Swift
Cannon	Hardy	Mudd	Switzer
Carter, Mass.	Harrison, Va.	Olney	Temple
Chandler, N. Y.	Haskell	Osborne	Tilson
Chandler, Okla.	Hayes	Palge	Tinkham
Coady	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Towner
Copley	Hicks	Peters	Vare
Dallinger	Hutchinson	Polk	Waldow
Darrow	Jones, Va.	Pou	Walsh
Dempsey	Juul	Powers	Ward
Denison	Kless, Pa.	Pratt	Wason
Dent	Lehlbach	Ramsey	Watson, Pa.
Dupré	Longworth	Rodenberg	White, Me.
Dyer	Lufkin	Rogers	Williams
Elliott	McArthur	Rose	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.	Winslow
Elston	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodyard
Fairfield	McLemore	Sanford	
Focht	Madden	Siegel	
Francis	Mann	Slayden	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Bankhead	Browning	Johnson, Wash.	Wise
Boohai	Glass		

NOT VOTING—99.

Anthony	Edmunds	Kraus	Rowe
Bell	Fairchild, B. L.	Kreider	Rowland
Black	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Mich.
Campbell, Pa.	Flynn	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Cantrill	Foss	Little	Scully
Capstick	Fuller, Mass.	McAndrews	Sears
Carew	Gallivan	McClintic	Sisson
Clark, Fla.	Garland	McCormick	Slemp
Clark, Pa.	Goodall	McCulloch	Small
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	McFadden	Snyder
Costello	Griest	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Crago	Graham, Pa.	McKeown	Stevenson
Cramton	Hamilton	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sullivan
Crisp	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Talbott
Currie, Mich.	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Mondell	Treadway
Davis	Hollingsworth	Morin	Van Dyke
Dies	Hood	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Dooling	Hust	Phelan	Walker
Doughton	James	Platt	Watson, Va.
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	White, Ohio
Dunn	Kahn	Ragsdale	Wilson, La.
Eagan	Kehoe	Randall	Zihlman
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SISSON (for) with Mr. PARKER of New York (against).

Mr. BOOHER (for) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for) with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD (against).
 Mr. BELL (for) with Mr. GOULD (against).
 Until further notice:
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
 Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. ZIHLMAN.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. JAMES.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. LITTLE.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
 Mr. CRISP with Mr. FESS.
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. BLACK with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. CRAIG.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. EAGLE with Mr. CRAMTON.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. PLATT.
 Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. McFADDEN.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. RANDALL with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SCOTT of Michigan.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a pair with my colleague, Mr. TALBOTT, and I want to withdraw my vote and be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.
 The Clerk called the name of Mr. BROWNING, and he answered "Present."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a pair with Mr. JAMES, of Michigan, who, if he were here, would vote the same way. I wish my vote to stand.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand my name was called on the second roll call. I voted "aye" on the first roll call. I desire to have the RECORD corrected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.
 The Clerk called the name of Mr. ALEXANDER, and he voted in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KEHOE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING BILL.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that what is known as the Senate daylight-saving bill be given a privileged status.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I object.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill which has just been passed. I wish to do so for the purpose of criticizing the bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
 Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.
 The SPEAKER. As to what?

Mr. KEARNS. To extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Ohio desires to extend his remarks on the bill just passed?

Mr. KEARNS. That is what I asked.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio, that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD, the remarks to be confined to the bill just passed as nearly as he can?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

On March 8, 1918:

H. R. 6361. An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war.

On March 11, 1918:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending matter is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to strike out a certain paragraph of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed could I ask the Chair to have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment indicated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: Page 105: strike out the paragraph beginning on line 5 and ending on line 17, which reads as follows: "Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1918, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any position with a salary of \$2,250 or above than sum."

Mr. RUCKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee I will be very glad to explain as best I can the significance of this paragraph in the bill, and the reasons which I think justify the motion to strike it out.

The Bureau of Pensions is not a new creation. It has been in the service of the Government a long time, for many years. It is a fact well known to gentlemen on both sides of the aisle that many of the employees in the Pension Bureau are veterans of the Civil War. Necessarily that class of employees in the service of the Pension Bureau are aged men. In this connection let me say that in response to a question propounded to the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions by the chairman having this bill in charge as to the average age of the employees in the Pension Bureau, the Deputy Commissioner stated that a careful examination recently made showed that the average age of all the employees in the service of that bureau is 57 years. Even the chairman and his associate who sits on the other side of the aisle evidently were somewhat astounded at the information, because—immediately the inquiry was made—I do not know that I quote the question verbatim, but I do in substance:

"That does not include the messenger boys, does it?" The answer was, "Yes; it includes them all." When you consider and include messenger boys in that service, which, of course, reduces the general average of the age—because they are quite young men—the average age of those who are to-day performing service in that bureau is 57 years. They run from among the youngest men in the Government service to the very eldest. There are men there past 80 years of age, a number of them. And so it happens, and it happens without a complaint or protest of any mortal man who is patriotic, generally speaking, these old men, these old veterans, hold the highest-paid positions. The committee having in charge the preparation of this bill, which is brought in and passed by the House and by Congress annually, has for three or four years, without any sort of bad feeling, without any personality, but persuaded by an erroneous, and I think a faulty judgment, has been whittling away at the organization of the Pension Office.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will my colleague yield right there?

Mr. RUCKER. I do.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is any provision similar to this carried in the bill against any other bureau?

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the gentleman asked me that, because I do not want to forget it. I will reply in a moment.

I repeat, if there be an error in the policy of the committee, I will assume that it is merely an error of judgment, and I want if I can to appeal to the judgment of each member of this committee to help correct the error. The Committee on Appropriations is the servant of the House and not its master. If I, as your servant, should err in my judgment, would you blindly follow my lead after you have considered the facts and discovered my error? Or will you say to your public servant: "You must respond to the will of the House whose servant you are!" Any other course produces right here under the dome of the Capitol of the Nation a condition against which men are to-day pledging their lives, an autocracy that can not be tolerated.

My colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asks if there is any provision similar to the one which was read from the Clerk's desk a moment ago, which the pending amendment seeks to strike out, with reference to any other bureau in the public service, and in the presence of the chairman of the committee that framed the bill I answer no; there is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for 10 minutes. I do not think I will ask any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. There are many bureaus in the departments of the Government here, some in their infancy. There are bureaus all over the town, in all the different departments, and they are multiplying and growing like mushrooms. New ones are being organized practically every day; but you can search the records of congressional proceedings until you tire and you will not find, with reference to a single other bureau, an effort to place shackles upon Government agencies like those which gentlemen would bind around and upon the employees and those in charge of the Pension Bureau. I ask the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill not to forget to answer in his own time to the membership of this House why a distinct, positive, unmistakable discrimination is made against the officials and clerical force of the Pension Bureau. I would not appeal to partisan spirit and I would not suggest that, because gentlemen high in authority on the Committee on Appropriations come from States in a certain section of this Nation, that such fact has anything to do with the question, because on the other side are gentlemen who come from other sections who are in harmony with the action of the committee. But I ask gentlemen on either side of the aisle to give the House some reason why this particular bureau should be discriminated against in this way? May I say that it seems to me this discrimination is so bad and so pronounced as to cast a reflection upon distinguished and honorable men charged with the administration of the affairs of that bureau? Do gentlemen say they have been prodigal? Have they been neglectful? Have they been inefficient? Have they done anything to merit this kind of unfriendly and offensive treatment at the hands of Congress? But gentlemen say the work is getting less, that the old soldiers are dying, and that is a lamentable truth which we all know. They are dying, and dying fast. But, in the providence of God, they are leaving good widows, many of them; they are leaving children; and, notwithstanding the large death rate which annually decimates the ranks of these old men who a few years

ago wore the blue so proudly and so bravely in defense of this great Nation of ours, the truth is that, notwithstanding the columns of these old veterans are broken by the invasion of the angel of death, and that many of them annually respond to the last roll call, there are substantially as many names on the pension roll now, I think, as there were a year ago—not of soldiers, perhaps, but of widows of soldiers and the children of soldiers.

And again I will say that this Congress, whether rightfully or wrongfully, a year or so ago enacted what is called the Ashbrook law, which has brought to the Pension Office more than 175,000 extra applications for pensions to be disposed of by that bureau.

Then, there is the bill with reference to the Spanish-American War soldiers, which entailed very much additional work on the bureau. That is recent legislation. There is legislation on the calendar now, which I think I am warranted in saying will become a law, which is going to add still further to the work of the bureau.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not a fact that the correspondence of the bureau is further behind now than it has been in recent years? Is not that the gentleman's experience? It is mine. I know they are behind with their correspondence. I have had numerous instances of it lately.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a direct answer to that question may be at variance with the experience of Members of the House who do any considerable amount of pension work, for the reason that I am privately informed by the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions that the work is practically current, so far as correspondence with Members of Congress is concerned. He makes a special effort to keep up with congressional correspondence, but the thousands of cases which come direct to the Pension Bureau have caused them to get behind in their work. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] is right.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to say that I have cases in mind now, dozens of them, where answers to letters which I have written to the bureau have not been received for three weeks after the inquiry was submitted, and the explanation has been made to me that they were behind with their correspondence. I am not criticizing the bureau, which, I think, is doing the best it can with the force at its command. I am merely combating the argument that they are up with their work. I know it is not so.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to have the gentleman say that, because I know the fact is that there has been a world of increase in their work there.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Would the fact of the bureau being up to date with its correspondence be any indication of there being no necessity for more help?

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman frankly that that would be one way by which we would determine the adequacy of the help, but not necessarily conclusive.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The suggestion I want to bring home to the gentleman and the House is the fact that you might get a prompt reply, but the party about whom you were writing might have to wait months and months.

Mr. RUCKER. There is no question about that.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. They have to wait months for the aid that this bureau should give practically at a moment's notice.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman emphasizes that thought.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman permit me something not in the form of a question? If there is anything in the world, or any bureau in the world, where there should be a sufficient clerical and field force to respond to the needs and necessities of the American people, it is the Bureau of Pensions. There should be no delay. Once a claim is submitted, there should be an expeditious handling of the claim, and I do not believe in stinting it under any circumstances.

Mr. RUCKER. I am obliged to the gentleman from Rhode Island for his statement. Let me say to the committee—and I know that I am looking into the faces of gentlemen who have had similar experiences—that time and again I have put forth my efforts to bring relief to some suffering old man, or suffering old widow of a soldier, to hasten action on a pension claim as much as I could with conditions existing as they do at the Pension Office, and yet before the Government could extend to the man the little bounty it had pledged to him and scatter a little sunshine, hope, and joy into his life, that soldier or widow, as the case may have been, has been summoned from this world. There are many cases of that sort. Men die wait-

ing for action because some men in the country say that we do not need any more force in the Pension Bureau, because the old soldiers are fast dying. I confess that I become a little excited when I hear men speaking of those things unfeelingly, I think.

Let me tell you what this bill proposes. It proposes, as I said, a distinct discrimination. In all the numerous, countless bureaus of this Government there is no provision like this. Listen to this: Mark you, in this very bill you cut out about 100 employees in the Pension Office. Is that not true, I ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Forty-three.

Mr. RUCKER. Only 43; I thought it was more than that. Notwithstanding that and notwithstanding it will be said to you to-day that those who fought during the War of the Rebellion are dying rapidly, and that must be confessed and admitted to be true, yet the committee in this bill says:

Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1918.

In the corresponding bill which was enacted last year similar language was carried; so if there were three vacancies in a certain class, or in many classes, not actually filled—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER (continuing)—

Nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion.

Do gentlemen comprehend what that means? Here are a number of classes, class 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and in some of the classes quite a number of people are necessarily employed in order to do the work that the Government ought to and must do. This committee exercises an iron control, almost a despotic power, in curtailing the number of clerks in every class in the Pension Bureau when they think more clerks are employed than are needed, and only appropriate for those which they—the committee—finds are needed. If in this bill they appropriate for 75 clerks of a certain class it is because this committee realizes that that number of clerks are needed. Then, mark you, what follows? I will assume that there are 75 clerks in class 1, for argument. This bill provides that not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies actually occurring in any grade during the fiscal year shall be filled by promotion or by original appointments.

Here these gentlemen solemnly determine that the bureau needs 75 clerks for the ensuing year, and appropriate for them, but during the year 3 clerks may die, and hence there would be three vacancies. You ask why not fill them? The answer is because these gentlemen, the Committee on Appropriations, say that you shall not fill them. They say you can only fill 25 per cent of the places, and therefore it requires four vacancies in order to secure one appointment. If three men die in class 1 and class 2 and class 3 and class 4, thus creating twelve vacancies, in each of which the Committee on Appropriations says a clerk is needed, yet the vacancies can not be filled either by promotion or original appointment, because there were only three to die in each class, and the Appropriations Committee has decreed that there must exist four vacancies in each class before one place can be filled either by promotion or appointment.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. In the event that there are only three employees in class 1, what provision is made for filling that vacancy if it requires four?

Mr. RUCKER. The Committee on Appropriations is a progressive committee, and it has made some progress. They had that sort of a proposition in the bill the year before or two years ago, but this limitation has been liberalized some little since then.

I speak candidly, and I say that this committee, after much deliberation, solemnly came into this House last year, if I am not mistaken as to the date, with a provision which in the event of death or catastrophe having removed all of the medical examiners, that would have left the bureau without a single medical examiner, because the bill declared that there should be no filling of any place unless four vacancies should exist. See how peculiar it is. If gentlemen say we need four clerks in a given class, why require all four to die, and then only allow the promotion or appointment of one to take the place of

four. If such a policy must exist in this country, I insist that it should, as a matter of fairness and right, be a universal policy, because one of the principles that I learned early in life was that there should be no special favoritism shown in these matters and no unjust discrimination against men who are honestly and courageously performing official duties.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. HAMLIN. Awhile ago something was said about the work being current. I took occasion yesterday to read the testimony in regard to this matter, and I remember very well that the Deputy Commissioner said it was practically current so far as the correspondence went in collecting the testimony, but they did not have the force to make it anything like current in adjudicating the cases after they came in, which is the principal and main thing. He also testified there were a good many vacancies incurred by transfers from his bureau to other bureaus in the Government where they paid better salaries than they could afford to pay there. Then, under the provision the gentleman is discussing, they can not fill those unless there are three.

Mr. RUCKER. Certainly not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. The bill provides that four men in the Pension Office resign from it before they can put in one in the service. I yield to the gentleman who has arisen.

Mr. GOOD. It is a fact that no clerk can secure a transfer without the consent of the chief of the bureau in which he is employed, so if transfers are being made they are made with the consent of the Commissioner of Pensions, and he certainly would not consent to them if he is in such dire straits as the gentleman stated.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is correct, but why should the officials refuse transfers when you say here that if three men die in a class during this fiscal year the vacancies shall not be filled either by appointment or promotion. If some of those men who are doomed to go from that bureau by virtue of this odious limitation, who have been working so faithfully all these years, because you have refused to appropriate for them, and the chairman says this bill fails to appropriate for 43 clerks who were provided for in the bill passed last year—if those unfortunate clerks over whose heads the ax is swinging, soon to be dropped with disastrous consequences to them, can find a place in some other bureau, why not let them be transferred to some other service?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that about 18 months ago I filed quite a number of widows' claims in the Bureau of Pensions. Shortly after the applications were filed I filed all the necessary evidence in order to prosecute the claims. Several months elapsed, and I wrote the commissioner asking him why the claims had not been allowed. I was advised after 18 months had elapsed there were still 48,000 claims pending in the Bureau of Pensions, and that these claims were taken up in the order in which they were filed, and it was not possible to grant these pensions until they were reached in the regular order.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does it seem like the proper thing to do, like the wise thing to do, if these old widows, some of them 85 years old, are compelled to wait for 18 months to 2 years to have their claims adjudicated, when all of the necessary evidence has been furnished—is it proper and wise for this committee to decrease the force further or to increase it?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, the gentleman's question answers itself. Unless we intend to slap that bureau in the face, we ought to give them adequate force. No one will deny that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It has been reported—I have heard it several times, and I want to ask the gentleman if he has made any investigation in respect to it—that there is a studied attempt being made for the purpose of discrediting the Pension Bureau on account of the new War-Risk Bureau, and for the purpose of boosting the new War-Risk Bureau so that it will eventually take over the pension end of this Government?

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman that I have heard such rumors, but really I can not think they are true. I still insist, hard though it is for me to do so, that this is simply a matter of bad judgment on the part of this committee. I do not think the committee can be actuated by a desire to turn the Pension Bureau, with its corps of well-trained and efficient clerks, over to the War-Risk Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, let me remind gentlemen that civil-service law is in force in this land. The present administration favors it and past administrations favored it. Gentlemen who are on this committee, and I think every one of them, stand sponsors for civil service, but when it comes to the Pension Bureau they contradict their every act in official life and insist that as to this one bureau clerks and employees engaged there shall not enjoy the rights, emoluments, and benefits of civil service. If there is anything in civil service to justify any sane man in voting for it or standing for it, it is that idea of equality and reward for merit, that idea that you or I or any man in the land, though inexperienced, may, by faithful effort, by loyal and patriotic endeavor, by assiduous care and devotion to the work intrusted to us shall in recognition of valuable services be moved up a step to a more responsible place, with possibly a little pittance more of compensation, when vacancies occur for which we are eligible and qualified.

The very soul of civil-service law is the hope that encourages one to confidently believe that if he continues to prove his fidelity to his country, his loyalty to his Government, and his fidelity to duty, that when a vacancy higher up occurs those in authority will say to him, step up higher; we will reward the patriotic, diligent, and untiring efforts of a faithful and worthy clerk. But in the Pension Bureau see, oh, see, how dark and dismal is the future to one of these civil-service employees of that office. There is no hope—no chance for promotion. No. Why? Because this group of distinguished men—the Committee on Appropriations—selected by us to serve us, have determined that, however faithful the service of any man in that bureau, there shall be no reward for his fidelity, there is no hope of his promotion, but he must be doomed to sit at the desk where he started in life with every avenue of advancement closed to him.

Gentlemen, is it possible that the representatives of a great Nation will, without reason or excuse for the act, after they have had their attention called to it, deal so harshly and cruelly with men intrusted with the performance of official duties and who always have been true and loyal to their obligations? I hope you will wipe out this section by unanimous vote. Give the boy in the Pension Bureau an even opportunity in life; give him a chance if he is worthy of it, if he is loyal, if he is sober, if he is faithful, if he performs his duty well, give him the same chance to be promoted that every other clerk in every other department of this Government enjoys.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Do not we owe more to the soldiers and their widows in expediting the adjudicating of their claims?

Mr. RUCKER. I am trying, if I can, to avoid a discussion of that thought, because I am afraid there may be those somewhere to whom such an appeal would be fruitless. I believe if gentlemen who are in my presence to-day could go and see what I have seen, if they could visit the humble home of some man who bled and almost died for that flag, if they could see how dark and dismal with despair are many of the humble abodes of good, brave, and true men, and hear the shrieks of agony that come from widows, emaciated and broken by the burdens of life, their helpless children whose father's proudest boast was that he was a faithful, brave Federal soldier, they would join with me in calling on this committee to take out of the bill that which I think does injustice to the sense of fairness of this House, and which I think stigmatizes the Pension Bureau, and which I think ought to be repudiated by every fair-minded man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] closed with a very eloquent appeal in behalf of his amendment to strike out this paragraph, but I think I can show to the committee that there is nothing in this provision which is recommended by the committee and nothing in the status of the work now in the Pension Office which justifies the appeal just made. Now, the gentleman speaks of this proposition as if it were a new one. As a matter of fact, this provision of law was first carried in an appropriation bill five years ago, and every year, without exception, the gentleman from Missouri has made a motion to strike it out, and has delivered an appeal such as he made here to-day, and the House has consistently refused to adopt his motion. Now, if you will pardon me for a moment, I want to state to you the reason which influenced the committee originally in placing this provision in the law. The committee found five years ago

that there was an extraordinary number of clerks in the Pension Office. The committee felt that in the interest of economy, efficiency, and better administration something should be done to reduce the force in the Pension Office. Now, no one of the committee was willing to turn out any civil-service employee of the Pension Office, whether old or young. We were not willing to do an injustice to any employee of the Pension Office by eliminating the position that he held, because I want to say to you that we have no disposition whatever to deny the Pension Office a single clerk that is necessary to do the work of that office. On the contrary, we want the Pension Office to have all the force that is necessary to dispose of claims in that office at the earliest possible moment, and that is the desire of every member of the committee, coming as they do from every section of this country. But, as I say, confronted as we were with the patent proposition that there were too many clerks in the Pension Office, feeling that something should be done to reduce them, and at the same time not desiring to work any injury upon any particular individual employed in that office, the committee finally decided to adopt the provision which was, I am told, recommended by a former Commissioner of Pensions, Mr. Warner, I think it was, many years ago, and carried in the bill at that time. So it was provided that in the succeeding fiscal year not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies occurring in the Pension Office should be filled by appointment.

In that way the committee felt that we could reduce the force in the office and at the same time do no injury to any employee in the office. That provision was carried in the bill for one or two years. Now, what happened? We felt, gentlemen of the committee, I want to say in all frankness, that the House and the committee were not shown the spirit of cooperation that was expected. If a \$1,800 clerk died or resigned, causing a vacancy, we immediately found in the next hearing that promotions were made from the lower to the \$1,800 grade without regard to the number in the respective grades. The result was that in a couple of years we found that the Pension Office was top heavy in the higher salaries, containing a much higher percentage of clerks getting those large salaries than any other bureau of any other department in the Government. And to prove that—

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. How does the average salary of the Pension Office compare with the average salary of the War-Risk Bureau, say, or any other bureau of the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have those figures. I am glad the gentleman referred to them, because I intend to present them to the House.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—I hope not to do so again—I understood the gentleman to say awhile ago that you have reduced the number of clerks about 47 this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Forty-three employees in this bill.

Mr. RUCKER. But in your report accompanying this bill, as I read it, it says the number of persons employed in the Pension Office in 1918—that is, for this fiscal year—was 1,091, and the number provided for in this bill is 962, making a difference of 129.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Some of the vacancies have occurred by transfer, but, as a matter of fact, this bill only seeks to omit 43 positions. I can show the gentleman the statement.

Mr. RUCKER. That is, 43 that were carried in the last bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. You drop out a whole lot this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, again, I just made the remark that the result of that provision—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The result was that we had a top-heavy force there in the Pension Office. We found a great big percentage of the clerks drawing \$1,800 and \$1,600 and \$1,400, and a correspondingly small percentage of clerks drawing \$1,100, \$1,000, and \$900.

Now, what could we do? As I say, without intending the least reflection on those in charge of the Pension Bureau, because I have the highest regard and esteem for them as capable, honest, and efficient Government officials, we felt that they had not altogether enforced the provision of law in the true spirit of its meaning and intention. But I want to say in justice to them that I do not think it was altogether their fault, because when an \$1,800 vacancy occurred I have no doubt but that

many Members of Congress rushed down to them and insisted that they should promote some \$1,600, \$1,400, or \$1,200 clerk, and we felt that in adopting this provision we were really relieving those gentlemen of the burden of resisting the importunities of Members of Congress who were bringing influence to bear in securing promotions for constituents of theirs in the Pension Bureau. So we adopted another provision that provided that not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies occurring in any one grade should be filled. And that is the way in which this provision was written into law.

Now, as bearing out what I said to you, and in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], let me tell you that there are now in the Pension Office a percentage of 6.1 drawing \$2,000 and more; 11.7 per cent drawing \$1,800; 8.9 per cent drawing \$1,600; 25 per cent drawing \$1,400; 33.2 per cent drawing \$1,200; 6.5 per cent, \$1,000; 3.7 per cent, \$900; 2.3 per cent, \$840; six-tenths of 1 per cent, \$720; one-tenth of 1 per cent, \$660; and six-tenths of 1 per cent, \$420, and out of a total force of 962. In other words, at the present moment, gentlemen, there are \$5.5—now, listen to this—\$5.5 per cent of the entire force of the Pension Bureau getting \$1,200 or more and only 13.8 per cent getting less than \$1,200.

Now, let us compare that with the War-Risk Bureau, with a force of 1,844 persons. Only 17.6 per cent of the employees of the War-Risk Bureau get \$1,200 and over, as compared with 85.5 per cent of the Pension Bureau; 79.2 per cent of the War-Risk Bureau get less than \$1,200, as compared with 13.8 per cent in the Pension Office. Or, in other words, the average salary of the employees in the War-Risk Bureau to-day, gentlemen, is only \$1,063 per annum, while the average salary of the 962 employees in the Pension Office is \$1,374 per annum.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wish you gentlemen would let me get through, and I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wanted to ask a question pertinent at this point.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman in a few moments. I want to refer for a moment to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to the effect that the action of the committee was resulting in interfering with the efficient administration of the work in the bureau.

Now, I have a letter which was sent to me after the hearings were printed by the Assistant Pension Commissioner on January 10. He inclosed a letter addressed by the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau to the Pension Commissioner, and I shall read a portion of that letter to you and let you see from the statements of the chief clerk whether or not the action of the committee in the past has resulted in depriving the office of the necessary number of clerks to perform the work efficiently and promptly. What does he say? Listen:

Recent legislation has thrown considerable new and important work upon this bureau. By reason of deaths, transfers, resignations, and employees entering military service the force now engaged on the adjudication of pension claims is about 100 fewer than this time last year.

And you will observe that the decrease in force comes from the resignations of clerks to go into the military service and with other objects in view. He says further:

Notwithstanding this increase of work and decrease in help, the bureau has, by the adoption of new and simplified methods, the proper distribution of the clerks, the hearty cooperation of officials and employees, and the cutting of red tape, managed to expedite and handle with the proper care this additional work and at the same time keep current the regular work of the bureau.

[Applause.]

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, gentlemen, there is no denying that statement made by the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau, and he has done that, remember, with a hundred less employees than he had at this time last year.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman the date of the letter.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is December 31. It was sent to me on January 10.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Right along that line, let me ask the gentleman how he accounts for the fact that the bureau now, right at this time, is 12 months to 2 years behind in its work? If they are able to carry the current work up, how does he explain the proposition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I explain that by saying, with all due deference to the gentleman, that in that statement he takes issue with the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau and also with the hearings which were taken before the committee.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Let me say to the gentleman that last week I had occasion to call at the Bureau of Pensions. More than 18 months ago I filed a claim for an old Civil War widow. I filed all the evidence in the case shortly, within 60 days after the time the claim was filed. The old lady is past 85 years of

age. If I have written one letter to the Bureau of Pensions, I have written a dozen.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do not take all my time.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to finish this statement. I have written to the bureau asking why this claim has not been adjudicated, inasmuch as all the evidence had been filed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is, I think, easily explained. Mr. KEY of Ohio. He explained to me that he had not had the force.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The assistant commissioner stated to the committee that there were approximately 55,000 pensioners removed from the rolls during the last year, and that they had received 117,000 new applications. He further stated that under the Ashbrook law, which raised the pensions of widows, there were 175,000 applications for increase filed.

That law, as you know, was passed in September, 1916, less than two years ago. Yet the Assistant Pension Commissioner stated that, notwithstanding the fact that he had no increased force, they had disposed of 165,000 of those 175,000 applications. He said that on account of raising the limit of marriage from 1890 to 1905 there had been 48,000 cases filed, and there were 16,000 filed by reason of the change of law as to marriage; 9,000 cases were filed on account of the law giving pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars, and 40,000 claims in other classes.

Now, he did say that in the work on claims in which evidence has been presented the office would be current by the 1st of June or July. You gentlemen know how difficult it is to get the necessary evidence. Sometimes the claims have to be sent back to the field and to the pension examiners time and time again before the proof is fully established so that it can be passed upon. I have had the same experience myself. I have had claims which have been sent to one State and then to another State to pension examiners for the purpose of securing evidence.

Now, when the gentleman says that those claims are behind, he states what is necessarily true.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have no objection to the present chief clerk of the bureau bragging on his own administration of his office. He is a personal friend of mine, and I desire to commend him for his faithful and efficient service. But I do know that the bureau is not up to date with its work, and I can pick out a dozen cases from memory right now where—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman may pick out a dozen cases or he may pick out a hundred cases from his district, because he has a great many from his district—

Mr. LANGLEY. That is true—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I submit to him that in cases where there has been a considerable delay it has been because the applicants have not furnished the necessary proof in the first instance to secure action on the claims. The cases have to be sent sometimes to different pension examiners before the Pension Commissioner can act in one way or another upon them.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; but that argument does not apply to the case referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] and many others that I know of of a similar character, where the applications and the evidence were filed and months and months elapsed before any action, or where the applications have been filed and months pass by before they call for evidence in the cases. I am not criticizing the bureau; I am merely stating facts that are within my personal knowledge.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If you will turn to page 567 of the hearings you will find that the assistant commissioner testified that all work would be current by the 1st of June or July. We are not making provision here that will become effective before that date, so that before this money is available all the work, according to the Assistant Commissioner of Pensions, will be current, and they will start off with that work current; and this force is to be 100 men more than they now have to do the work next year.

Mr. RUCKER. One hundred less.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wish to repeat, gentlemen, that the committee is not actuated by any other purpose save that of bringing about or continuing the efficient and proper administration of the Pension Bureau and at the same time eliminating any clerks that may not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You gentlemen know that under the law which was passed last fall every application for pension to-day by a soldier who was in the Army after October 6 goes not to the Pension Office, but to the War-Risk Bureau. The Pension Office does not consider applications for pensions—

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not the time. They do not consider applications for pension on the part of the soldiers who are in the Army to-day. They go to the War-Risk Bureau. Now why, under those circumstances, should we undertake to adopt this provision and permit this bureau to again unduly increase their force if they see fit to do it?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And not only increase it, but, as they did in the past, build up a great, big, top-heavy bureau of high-salaried clerks in comparison with other bureaus in this Government, because I say to you, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is not a bureau in any department of the Government that has nearly so large a percentage of high salaries as are now being paid in this particular bureau, and it is for that very reason that the committee adopted this provision, and it is for that reason that I ask you to sustain the committee in this matter by voting down this amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman speaks of the bureau being top-heavy. It could not put in more men of one class than the committee appropriates for, could it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know this, that to-day, when he talks about there being such a great necessity for clerks, it developed in the hearings that they had a \$1,600 and \$1,800 position that had been vacant for a time?

Mr. RUCKER. They could not fill it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg your pardon. They could have done so.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me ask you a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will read to you what Mr. Tieman said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Tennessee offered to answer questions.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be able to direct the gentleman's attention to what he wishes to quote. The gentleman will find it on page 559 of the hearings.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I read:

Mr. BYRNS. Take the 34 vacancies which have occurred since July 1, and give us those grades.

Mr. TIEMAN. One medical examiner, \$1,800; one chief of division, \$2,000; three principal examiners, \$2,000—

Now, mark you—

four clerks of class 4, \$1,800—

Those were vacancies existing at present, where under the existing provision he could appoint one. Then—

four clerks of class 3, \$1,600—

Where he could appoint a clerk whom he had not appointed and where we have reason to assume he does not need that clerk—

seven clerks of class 2—

And yet no appointment to that vacancy, although he is entitled under this provision to make an appointment—

five clerks of class 1, \$1,200—

But no appointment has been made under existing law. There is the proof that he has an adequate force.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? That indicates that the Pension Bureau has not been prodigal, but exceedingly careful about filling places where they are not needed.

Mr. STAFFORD. It indicates that they have ample force down there, and we followed that in fixing the number of clerks in the respective grades, basing our action upon this information, so that in the next fiscal year the bureau will not be hampered in any way whatsoever.

Mr. RUCKER. It means that they are not advancing clerks in the bureau where they do not need them, does it not?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; it means that they are not employing clerks in the respective grades where they can employ them.

Mr. RUCKER. It does not mean anything of the kind. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] another question, if he will permit me. Will the gentleman be kind enough to read the following paragraph of that letter which he received from the chief clerk down there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean with reference to the 60,000 applications?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. The paragraph which shows that there are 60,000 unadjudicated claims in the bureau right now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is stated in the hearings.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman has not read it. Will he kindly read that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The paragraph to which the gentleman refers reads as follows:

There are now approximately 60,000 active pending claims in the bureau. There are also over 350,000 invalid pensioners now on the roll. These pensioners are dying at the rate of about 30,000 per annum. It is estimated that the death of 30,000 invalid pensioners occasions the filing of approximately 20,000 new claims—widows', minor children's, dependents', and reimbursement claims—and that the death of a certain number of widow pensioners will cause the filing of claims amounting to about one-fifth of that number, which would be, according to the number of widows dying each year, about 5,000 claims.

Now, that is practically the only source from which this Pension Bureau will get its additional claims unless new legislation is passed, because, as I just stated, under the law as it reads to-day, all claims for pensions on the part of soldiers in the Army after October 6 go to the War-Risk Bureau.

Mr. RUCKER. But the gentleman knows there have been a whole lot of applications caused by deaths and injuries before October 6.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why should we undertake to maintain this force at its present size, when the work must necessarily grow less?

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Until my time expires.

Mr. MAPES. I have heard it stated that it was the policy of the bureau to delay the granting of the applications of widows on the theory that they are dying off rapidly, and that if the bureau delays the granting of their pensions a year or so it will not be necessary to give a great many of them a pension at all. What does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not believe that there is any truth in that sort of a statement.

Mr. MAPES. I hope there is not.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I certainly hope there is not, and my knowledge of the gentleman in charge of the Pension Bureau is such as to make me say that I am satisfied that there is no justification for that sort of a statement.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I had four cases this last year of persons who required the coming of a special examiner to examine their cases, and the special examiners came at four different times, incurring the expense of coming from Washington on four separate trips instead of taking the four cases at one time. They were all pending at the same time and could all have been examined at one time. They came at four different times, which delayed all of the cases. There has been an unwarrantable delay in case after case. I can not see any reason at all for it, and there is no excuse for it. I do not know what to make of it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can see no reason for it, either, unless it be that there was some difficulty in securing the necessary evidence.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Not at all. The evidence was easy. I have in my pocket now a case where the evidence has all been supplied, and yet I have seen a letter from the Pension Department demanding that the same evidence be furnished again, and the evidence has been supplied.

Mr. RUCKER. I am sure there is some mistake about that. But I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to tell us if there is any other bureau in the Government treated in this way?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; for there has been no necessity for this sort of a provision in any other bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], speaking so resolutely

for economy. I believe that, of all the bureaus of all the departments in the Government, the last place where there should be any cheese-paring spirit is the Bureau of Pensions, because it is so intimately connected with the good and welfare of American homes. Its action means comfort in old age for worthy pensioners. It means that those who served the country in its hour of stress and labor should be treated not only courteously and efficiently but promptly. I yield to no man in my expression of gratitude to those who did their part in the days when men were needed; and whenever a claim is presented to the Bureau of Pensions it should receive prompt consideration. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] says they should have all the help that is necessary. Well, if that be so, the gentleman ought to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman pardon me? If the amendment which is now pending be adopted, it will not add a single man to the roll who is not now provided for.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. It merely keeps in office those who are there, and who, in my opinion, are insufficient to do the work.

Mr. LANGLEY. And it gives a chance for the promotion of worthy employees.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman quotes the chief clerk of the Bureau of Pensions. I am going to quote the deputy commissioner, Mr. Tieman. I presume the deputy commissioner is rated a little higher than the chief clerk.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman pardon me for just one moment in that connection, to say one word that is personal?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The Deputy Commissioner of Pensions of the United States, Mr. Tieman, came to Washington as my private secretary. He was with me, my confidential man, for 15 years. He got the place he has to-day on the recommendation of a large number of the membership of this House, by reason of his faithfulness, his fidelity, and his knowledge of pension matters. There is no better man in the employ of the Government to-day than the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. That is right.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I look upon the postponement of a petition by a veteran or a widow or dependent children as the refinement of cruelty by this Government. [Applause.] I can readily understand that old men and old women may be passing away in poverty, in sorrow, in tears, simply by virtue of the fact that the Government of the United States is lax in its prosecution of their petition. Cite to me anything more diabolical than the postponement of a worthy petition by a veteran of the Civil War.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. LOBECK. Are not the most of these petitioners women?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. And the postponement in their case is more severe than it would be if it was in the case of a man?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Absolutely so. This House has done something for the women in generously voting them suffrage, but they are saying to these old widows, "We will consider your petition months from now." I am going to read a letter from the deputy commissioner to me, and it happens, by the way, that it is dated January 10, 1918, the same date as the letter read by the gentleman from Tennessee from the chief clerk. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, January 10, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE F. O'SHAUNESSY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. O'SHAUNESSY: Answering inquiries made in your letter of the 8th instant in regard to delays in this bureau "in answering letters and settling claims," you are advised, in addition to the information contained in the attached report of the chief clerk of the bureau at the end of the last calendar year, that of the 80,000 active pending claims it is estimated that 20,000 are widows' claims, under the act of September 8, 1916 (the Ashbrook law), in which completing evidence has been filed.

It has been the practice to consider these claims in the order in which the evidence was filed, and claims in which evidence was received up to June 19, 1917, are now being handled in their regular turn. First calls for evidence are being made in claims received up to November 1. Indian-war claims (act of Mar. 4, 1917) are about 60 days in arrears of reports from official sources in regard to the fact of service and length of same.

Other classes of claims are either practically current or within 60 days of being so.

Of the number of pieces of mail received during the last calendar year 67,000 were congressional letters. Except when they related to claims in certain stages of adjudication, replies to these letters are current in a majority of the divisions of the bureau. In those divisions where correspondence is heaviest replies are sometimes delayed from 10 days to 3 weeks. The delay in answering miscellaneous correspondence is much longer, often from 3 to 6 months.

In this connection I will say that 915 persons are employed in the bureau in the performance of clerical duties, and the average age of these employees is 57 years. I beg to say, further, that the difficulties under which the bureau is laboring could be entirely removed if the 25 per cent limitation clause inserted in the appropriation act, and which relates to the Pension Bureau alone, were eliminated. This would permit the appointment of such clerical help as is needed to keep the work more nearly current and to obviate those conditions which result from a restriction preventing the most effective adjustment of the force employed in the bureau to the labors to be performed in administering pension laws now in existence or which may hereafter be enacted.

Very truly, yours,

E. C. TIEMAN,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In view of that statement of the Assistant Pension Commissioner, will the gentleman tell the committee why they have not filled the vacancies of the \$1,800 clerk and the \$1,600 clerk, which have existed down there for several months?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. It has been answered by some gentlemen on this side, that the work of these men is of a special character, and may be men in another division or another class which they have not the power to fill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are all clerks in that class.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not care whether they are specially trained or not. What I am here advocating is a decent treatment of the Pension Bureau and of the people that have to do business with the Pension Bureau.

It ill becomes the Congress of the United States to take such a position as is attempted to be taken by the chairman of the committee in this bill. [Applause.] Let me say that my complaint was not based on pique, it was based on delay. I am not one of those fractious individuals that takes umbrage at the slightest delay. There must have been some continuing reason for my interrogation of the bureau. While I recognize the splendid work they are doing I would strengthen their hands by retaining the force which in my opinion is not sufficient to do the work.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him to ask a question of the chairman of the committee at this point?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. At the time of the hearings, I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there was not very much discussion between the subcommittee and the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions that was not put in the hearings?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There may have been some discussions.

Mr. RUCKER. In that conversation did not Mr. Tieman make it plain as possible that what he needed was to cut the shackles that bound him by taking out this 25 per cent limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can not get some limitation on this debate.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to see if we can not get some limitation on this debate. I am a little embarrassed in asking it, because I consumed so much of the time myself. I am not going to object to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Rhode Island, but I am going to see if we can not agree on a certain length of time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Reserving the right to object, I believe if the gentleman will modify his request a little there will be no objection to it. The gentleman says "on the paragraph and all amendments thereto."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have discussed the matter at great length.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is so genial that I want to pay my respects to him once more before I quit. Let the gentleman confine his request "to this amendment."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will make it 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee modifies his request by making it 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Under certain conditions, I want five minutes. Does the gentleman's request contemplate that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Chair will control that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee has some understanding as to who shall occupy that time. He will have to inform the Chair in regard to that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the request.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion by making it 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall conclude at the expiration of 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] moves to amend it by making it 15 minutes. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee as amended.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I thought I was given five minutes under this combination. I would like to conclude in an orderly manner.

The CHAIRMAN. But the time of the gentleman from Rhode Island had expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I asked unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not agreed to.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island have 2 minutes outside of the 15 minutes agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I do not feel embarrassed because I take very little time of the House, but I would like to call attention to this salient fact, that we should be guided by the information of the deputy commissioner and not by that of the chief clerk. We should be guided by the necessities of those who do business with the Bureau of Pensions, and we should not be taken off our feet by this economical plea when we are extending the salaries of everybody in the employ of the Government. We have been cited to the case of some people down in the bureau who have been working there perhaps 50 years and have been receiving the munificent salary of \$2,000 a year. We are cited to that fact in order that we may now be economical. We are given in minute detail and refined percentages, so to speak, the number of men who are receiving \$1,800 a year, of those who receive \$1,400 a year, when the cry throughout the land is the increased cost of living, and then we, the Congress of the United States, say: "Do not mind the pensioners, do not mind the veterans, do not mind the widows, but keep on reducing the clerical force, and thus postpone the day when deserving pensioners obtain a hearing. I am opposed to that policy of delay." [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the original veteran pensioner is passing very fast. Not long will it be until he is but a memory. There were more than 30,000 of them who died last year. The State of Indiana contributed 224,000 original enlistments. There are but 18,000 remaining in Indiana of those original enlistments; but it is not true that the pension work is decreasing. The evidence shows that it is increasing, and the evidence and the practical experience of those who have to do daily with the Pension Department do not conform to the testimony of the chief clerk as submitted to the committee. Only this morning I received a letter from an old lady, the widow of an old soldier, who filed her application for a pension in 1916, furnishing all the evidence that was necessary. She has been waiting patiently from that day to this for some result. I have written three different letters on that one case and I have received back a courteous reply every time after some 10 days or three weeks, stating that the case is under consideration, with a view of early determination. I expect that is a stereotyped answer that every gentleman here receives from that office. If this bill passes as it is now reported, 43 of these men go out as a matter of course, according to the statement of the chairman. According to the figures submitted at the hearings more than 100 go out, and 25 per cent of those who die during the current year will not have their places filled.

If the business is increasing rather than decreasing there is no good practical sense in this proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have only five minutes. On the other hand, there is a very great reason why, especially at this time, an adequate force should be maintained down there. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] states from the hearings that their business is current. It depends on what you call current. If these pension claims, where the evidence is submitted, where there is no question about the proof, remain there unexamined and undetermined for 18 months or two years, then I do not like their idea of currency. The time has come with reference to the pensioner, with reference to the widow of the survivor of the war, when her pension claim in no instance, except in rare cases, should be pending to exceed six months. If there is not sufficient force to make an examination in that time there should be.

I wish to say in passing that if there ever was a time in the history of the world when we should reaffirm the promise that was made during the period from sixty-one to sixty-four, that the survivor of the war and his dependents would be the wards of this Nation and receive its constant care and attention, now is that time. We are asking others to do what they did. We should show by our example here that we are true to the promises then made, and if, forsooth, they are passing so rapidly to the beyond, then we should show that we will be true not only to the last one of them but to their dependents as well. I want to say that if conditions were now as they were during the first quarter of a century after the close of the Civil War, when the old soldier dominated this Congress and the legislation of the country, more regard would be paid to him. Now that he is going and has left a dependent widow or child, the duty is none the less incumbent upon those who are filling the place now on behalf of those who bared their breast that this Nation might survive, and that we might stand as a beacon light for democracy in the world; so that I say that now of all times we should not lay a hand upon this last refuge of the old soldier.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Woon] that we ought to give to this department every clerk essential to transact the business of the Pension Office with the greatest dispatch, but I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana and to the members of this committee that that is just what the committee in reporting this bill has done. The Ashbrook bill threw on the Pension Office a great many new claims, and yet during the year, according to the letter of the chief clerk of that office, with almost a hundred vacancies in the force by reason of military enlistments, and so forth, the commissioner passed upon 165 of those claims under the Ashbrook Act in addition to the regular business. The assistant commissioner testified that by the 1st of June next the work of the office will be current. Let me ask the gentleman from Indiana this question: If there is such great need for clerks down there, why is it that from the commissioner's office there has been detailed all of the year 13 clerks to other departments of the Interior, why is it—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana rose.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then why does the gentleman ask the question if he does not want an answer?

Mr. GOOD. Why is it that some of these clerks have been detailed since 1912, if there is a dearth of clerks in that office? Mr. Chairman, this House will find a greater problem confronting it if it adopts this amendment. The Pension Office is disappearing. The Pension Office to-day does not pass on a single claim of any of the men now serving in the Army and the Navy. Those claims go to the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance. One thousand persons, in round numbers, are employed in that office, and the problem is, how we are going to get rid of that large force after all of the work of the Pension Office has disappeared.

The committee took this matter into consideration when it originated this legislation several years ago. This legislation will not result in postponing for a single moment the consideration of a single claim.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I regret I can not.

Mr. RUCKER. It did not have in view the establishment of the War-Risk Bureau five years ago, did it?

Mr. GOOD. No. Every claim that comes before the commissioner must go through a certain course of investigation. It must be sent in many cases out into the field, and the field investigators must investigate the facts that the commissioner desires investigated, and when those reports come back, then if there is a discrepancy in the report that discrepancy must be reconciled, and it is that investigation that takes the time. The trouble is with the red tape in the office and not in an

insufficient number of clerks. Why, if we even adopt this amendment, it does not affect the field force. It affects only the clerks here in the office, and if you have not sufficient clerks to do the work then why does the commissioner permit the details, some of whom have been detailed from 1912 down to the present time? Mr. Chairman, I have in my district an old soldiers' home. I have a great deal of correspondence with this department. I would not knowingly do a thing here to-day or in the Committee on Appropriations or anywhere that would postpone for a single minute the consideration of the claims of a soldier or the widow of a soldier. These claimants are getting old, and I sympathize with every effort to aid the Government to pass upon their claims with utmost dispatch. I have their interests in mind when I say this, but I have also in mind the interests of thousands of persons employed in the Pension Office—a disappearing office—and sooner or later you will be called upon to enact a law which practically eliminates a great many of those old and faithful employees, and there is hardly a man on the floor of this House to-day who would want to vote for that kind of a measure.

Mr. RUCKER. Is that the reason the gentleman wants to get rid of these employees a few at a time rather than all at once?

Mr. GOOD. We want to provide that no new ones be appointed, that the old ones remain there doing the work, and there are enough of them to do it promptly, for when this money will be available, according to Mr. Tieman's testimony, the work then will be current, notwithstanding the fact that he had in his office almost 100 persons less than were appropriated for, and he had in his office about 50 less than he will have during the year 1918, if this appropriation is used.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. RUCKER. If this amendment is adopted it will not add one single clerk you have not provided for?

Mr. GOOD. If it would not, the gentleman's argument falls to the ground. Then what is the gentleman complaining about?

Mr. RUCKER. I would strike out this limitation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee had the facts before it as the subcommittee had them presented by the officers of the Pension Bureau, in my opinion there would be no question whatsoever but what they would approve and ratify the action of the committee. No one on the committee desires to do aught that will cripple the Pension Bureau, but the committee recognized that the additional work imposed upon the bureau was because of the passage of the Ashbrook law in September, 1917. Under that law 175,000 applications for increases were presented, of which at the present time 165,000 have been disposed of.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield in five minutes. Under the two other provisions of that law relating to the granting of increases to widows who had remarried and a pensionable status to those who married after June 27, 1890, the commissioner himself says on page 567 of the hearings that all the work under the Ashbrook law will be current on June 1 of this year. Now, there is no additional legislation pending that will impose additional work upon that bureau except an increase of pensions of soldiers, and yet we see that the existing clerical force have been able to keep up with their work to the extent of 165,000 out of 175,000 applications for increased pensions to widows. But more. The deputy commissioner says that at the time of the hearing in the latter part of last year there were 29 vacancies existing in the respective grades above \$1,000 where he could have appointed five clerks, four of class 4, four of class 3, seven of class 2, and five of class 1. As he did not avail himself of the opportunity under the existing provision to appoint these additional clerks, that was proof positive to the committee that his present force was ample to meet, during the next fiscal year, the present needs, and more than ample to meet the needs of applications under the Ashbrook law which have been presented that will be passed upon and be made current on June 1 of this year. Since we passed this same provision last year we have passed the war-risk insurance law, which takes away all cases of pensions arising after the passage of that law. Now, what work will the Pension Bureau have to consider beginning with the next fiscal year—

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not as much new pension work as in the past and very little under the Ashbrook law—I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The gentleman asks the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield. I did not ask the gentleman; he is only pestering me. In the Pension Bureau at the present time there are 172 between the ages of 70 and 80 years.

We realize there are many chances that these men, occupying these high-salaried places, will drop out continually by reason of death. We do not remove anyone, but we say under this provision the Pension Bureau shall not have the privilege of promoting those clerks in the lower grades into these vacancies which are occurring, say, in the \$1,600 and \$1,800 grades, and we say they shall only appoint one in case of every four vacancies. This provision has been in the bill for the last three years. It worked no ill, even with the additional work imposed by the Ashbrook pension law, notwithstanding that the work under that law was great. I say with all frankness that the clerks we provide here, schedule for schedule, in the commissioner's office on July 1, 1918, will be ample to meet all the conditions. As set forth by the gentleman from Iowa, for several years there have been 17 detailed from this office into the respective bureaus of the Department of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Pensions, at any time he wanted those \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800 clerks detailed to those various offices, could command their services or direct their return.

The whole testimony shows that the Pension Bureau has a much of a clerical force as is needed. The question for the committee to determine is whether you are going to accept the judgment of the subcommittee, that spent days and weeks and months in the preparation of this detailed bill, or are going to follow the suggestions of Members who have only a superficial knowledge of the conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 42.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. RUCKER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 34, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of line 17, on page 105, and insert, at the end of line 16, "\$1,600 or less than that sum."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: Page 105, line 17, strike out "\$2,250 or above that sum" and insert, at the end of line 16, "\$1,600 or less than that sum," so that it will read: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any salary of \$1,600 or less than that sum."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

Mr. RUCKER. Hold on!

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, there are not enough independent men here voting, and I make the point there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. I am not sure that it is a proper question, but I would like to know who is running this bill, this side of the House or that side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This is a nonpartisan bill, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman does become nonpartisan at times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GARNER and Mr. STAFFORD requested tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. RUCKER and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 8, noes 91.

So the committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem at not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence for persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said bureau and for actual and other necessary expenses, including telegrams, \$90,000.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. COX. I offer an amendment to strike out the figure "4" and insert the figure "3."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the members of the committee to a very important matter, in my judgment. This morning I received the following telegram, dated Sterling, Ill., March 12, 1918:

Congressman JOHN C. MCKENZIE,
Washington:

Can you secure me point of enlistment of Walter E. Moore, reported among wounded in yesterday's casualty list.
(Signed) A. J. PLATT, Mayor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the fact that the War Department has issued an order that in reporting all soldiers killed and wounded in France the name of the soldier alone shall be given to the public. We are told that Gen. Pershing requested this to be done, and that he did so upon the request of the French Government. When the order was issued I felt, as I believe every Member of this House felt, that it was a mistake, and that instead of doing the thing they expected it to do, it would only aggravate the matter. And this is the first evidence from my district, and it is evidence which will be coming from every district in the United States in a few days, unless that order is changed.

In my judgment it is not necessary in publishing such lists to give all the details, but it would do no harm to say, for example, that Walter E. Moore, of Sterling, Ill., was wounded on a certain date, and not give the regiment or the company, or even the division to which he belonged.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will ask the gentleman if he does not believe it would be better not to give the name at all unless they are going to give us the address?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes; I do; and for this reason: On investigation I have found that this man Moore did not live in Sterling, Ill. Yet his father and mother, when seeing that name published in the local papers or in the Chicago papers, immediately thought perhaps it was their son. Upon investigation I found that the man enlisted in Montana. The effect of the present regulation will be that, if there are 100 Smiths in the Army in France and one Smith should be wounded, the mother of every soldier by the name of Smith in France will not rest until she has word as to whether or not it is her son.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am one of those, as I believe every Member here is, who is in favor of doing everything that will help our Government to win this war, and I would oppose anything that would give the great German Army any information that might aid in taking any advantage of our boys. But when an American boy lays down his life in France, or is even wounded there in upholding the colors of our country, I can see no harm in letting the people of this country know from what locality, at least, that boy came; and I hope that, in the wisdom of the War Department, that they will see the propriety of changing this order, which, to my mind, is uncalled for and unnecessary.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman say whether any information was furnished to our War Department giving the reasons in support of such an order? Can anybody give any sensible reason for it?

Mr. MCKENZIE. None; except that they are anxious to keep the Germans from knowing that the American boys are in front of them. But they will find that out.

Mr. LITTLE. That objection would be obviated if we would take them away from there. That would be as good a way as this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not mean to defend the practice, because I do not yet know enough of the reason for it; but I understand that it is the policy of the department to advise the relatives, or whoever the soldier may have given as his next friend, or next of kin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MCKENZIE. May I have one minute more?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The department advises those who are given by the soldier as his next friends. That is to say, in the case of the soldier to whom the gentleman refers, his friends in Montana were advised?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So that the parents of that boy, if they understand it, might feel perfectly safe unless they receive advice from the department itself; that is, if they understood it.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes. But the unfortunate part of this order is that here is a mother, perhaps, in Sterling, Ill., who thinks this is her son. She will not be advised, while the mother in Montana will be, and rightfully.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the mother in Illinois, if she understood the policy of the War Department, would feel perfectly safe, because she would know if it were her boy she would be informed, because the department has stated that the parents of soldiers would be advised.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I know that the War Department is doing what it believes to be the best in this matter, but I do not believe that even the War Department of our country can make no mistake, and I believe this is a mistake.

Mr. LITTLE. What difference would it make to the Germans to know whether the boy came from Austin, Tex., or Topeka, Kans.?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I can not see what difference it would make to the Kaiser of Germany, or to Von Hindenberg, or Ludendorff, or any great German general to know that John Smith, of Elizabeth, Ill., for example, was killed in front of their lines if the regiment was not named.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. Do you imagine that the French Government, after three years' experience, would have made an idle request of this Government? Of course, all of us ascribe a patriotic motive to the gentleman who makes this motion; but do you suppose the French Government, after three years of actual experience, would have presented an idle request to this Government, not backed by a good reason?

Mr. MCKENZIE. No; I do not. I impute no bad motive to the French Government, but I will say to my friend that in cutting off or denying the right to publish the number of the regiment or the division, that, in my judgment, is a wise military regulation; but I can not for my life see, when the name of a man is published as having come from a certain place, giving no connection whatever with the military organization, why it would affect in any way the safety of the other Americans in France. On the other hand, it would do away with this uncertainty that is bound to sweep over this land of ours if this order continues.

Mr. GLASS. As the gentleman from Tennessee has indicated, there ought not to be any uncertainty if the people will just understand that the nearest of kin or nearest in friendship will always be first apprised of any casualty by the War Department. Then nobody else ought to have any apprehension in the matter.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GILLET. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman think it possible that a mother, seeing only the name of her son in the paper, might

suspect that the War Department has failed to notify her, or that the notification had not reached her?

Mr. GLASS. Yes. That would be a very distressing circumstance. While I do not fully understand the situation myself, I can not conceive that the French Government, after three years of war, would make a request of this sort if there was not something of vital importance behind it. My own view is that there has been too much publicity about these matters.

Mr. McKENZIE. I may say to the gentleman that I feel this way in regard to this matter, so far as the French Government is concerned. I can not help but feel that there must be somewhere along the line a mistake in properly deciphering the cablegrams giving these orders, because I can not understand how the French Government could raise this question.

Mr. GILLET. Is the gentleman certain that the French Government did request the action taken by our War Department?

Mr. GLASS. No; I am not certain that the French Government did request the action taken by the War Department, except it has been specifically stated in the newspapers that the order was issued in pursuance to the request of the French Government, based on the supposition that these publications would furnish valuable information to the enemy, and that the request was concurred in by the English Government. Whether that is true or not I am not prepared to state.

Mr. MADDEN. There is one thing you can not change, a mother's hope or fear for her boy, and there ought not to be anything done to make it more difficult for her to bear the burden of sending her boy to the front than is necessary.

Mr. GLASS. Well, some of us have as much affection for our boys as others have, and if the boy is killed those who are most concerned are his parents, and if the parents are notified that ought to be sufficient. This thing of thinking that the public should be informed of everything that is done is a mistake, and I say that although I am a newspaper man myself.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman I simply want to say that some of us have not the good fortune to have boys in this Army, but I think every man in the House feels the same way about it, and I am sure he does, that notwithstanding the fact that we may not have sons of our own there we are interested in every boy that we know from our communities.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, I think so, too.

Mr. McKENZIE. And when we see the familiar name of a man in the list of casualties we would like to know whether he is from our community or not. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. I will say to my friend that I intended nothing personal in my observation. I am just insisting on my view that the French Government, if it did make this request, must have had some very good reason for it or it would not have made it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The British Government to-day publishes in the London Times daily a list of casualties. You can find the paper in the Library. If they have discontinued the practice it has been within the last month or so. They publish a casualty list, giving the command of the man who is killed or wounded. You will find long lists published each day. The French Government has never published any casualty list at any time. It has been the fixed policy of the French Government not to do that. But how much more dangerous is it for us to publish these lists than it is for the British Government to do so?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say right in that connection that so far as I am personally concerned I have no ill feeling in this matter, but I simply call the attention of the committee to the fact that in my judgment it would be infinitely better not to publish the lists at all than to publish them as they are now published.

Mr. GLASS. I do not ascribe any captious motive to my friend in bringing this to the attention of the House. Responding to the interruption just now, I apprehend that the reason why there is no objection to the publication of the lists that we see in the English newspapers is the fact that it is as well known to the German Army as it is to the English Army itself precisely what part of the front the English troops occupy. There may be good reasons for not wanting the Germans to know just what particular part of the front the American Army occupy at this time.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not the practice also to publish the names in the Canadian newspapers? I have seen in Canadian newspapers lists of names, giving the company, regiment, and division to which a man belongs.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not say as to that. I do not know.

Mr. ROBBINS. Further, in answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the gentleman seems to think there is a great objection to publishing the names of American soldiers, on the ground that it is not known that the Americans are over there. Is it not known that Americans have been captured, and that they have been in the front trenches for some time? Of course the Germans know that they are there.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment just to say this: All the statements that I have seen in the press in connection with this order of the War Department to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has just addressed himself have been more or less critical, and it has seemed to me that perhaps the press has inadvertently failed to carry to the next of kin of soldiers information that it could very properly carry, and in the carrying of which it would render great service. That is, that it is the policy of the War Department, under this kind of an order, as it was before, immediately upon receipt of information of a casualty to advise the next of kin of the soldier of that fact. If this could be clearly understood—and if this order is to continue it ought to be understood in the country—then the parents and the next of kin of soldiers of the same name would not be alarmed if they did not receive advices.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, they would.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Because, if they understood perfectly that they would be advised by the department, I do not think there would be any occasion for alarm.

Mr. MADDEN. You never could make a mother understand it though.

Mr. WASON. Can the gentleman inform the House how soon after the information reaches the War Department means are taken to inform the interested relatives?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know, except that I had this experience: There were two young men from my district on the *Tuscania*. One of them was saved and one of them was lost. I myself made inquiries as to both of them before definite information was received by the department. It had been promised that I would be advised. About 3 o'clock on a Sunday morning I called the department by telephone, and I learned that they had received definite information as to the young man who was saved. They had finished deciphering a cablegram at 1.30 a. m., and had sent out a telegram to the father of the survivor at 1.45 a. m. That was one experience. As to the case of the one who was lost I do not know how long it was before they had definite information. Of course, I do not know how long it takes to get the telegrams out, but that has been one case in my experience.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman understand that the department communicates with the relatives of the soldiers by wire?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. By wire in all instances where it is possible to send a wire. They have the telegraphic address and the mail address of the next of kin, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I move to amend the pro forma amendment by striking out two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out two words.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I just want to make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman. This is a matter in which everybody is deeply concerned, of course, and the mothers of the country are anxious and will continue to be so. Here is the situation: We have selected to take charge of our armies in France men in whom we have absolute confidence. I think everybody has confidence in Gen. Pershing as a military man and also confidence in those who serve under him. The news comes and is published in the paper that certain named men have been killed or wounded. Just as soon as possible thereafter the department notifies the next of kin, the parents of the boy, that their boy is killed or wounded. The other mothers in the country are, of course, extremely anxious. Now, here is the question: If their sons have not been killed or injured the day of their anxiety and sorrow will soon end; but it is the deliberate judgment of the men who have charge of our armies on the field that it would be to the best interest of the boys who are not injured if this information were not published. So they say to the mothers, "While you may undergo a few hours or a few days of unnecessary anxiety, feeling that this may be your boy, it is better that you do that, because by giving out this information it may give such an advantage of the enemy as may result in injury and perhaps death to your boy."

Now, who is the best judge of that? I think there can be no two sides to that question. The men in France who are charged with this great responsibility—I do not know whether this is the advice of the French Government or the English Government, but I understand from the press that it is and that Gen. Pershing

himself agrees to it. If that be true, is it not better for all of us that we suffer these few days of great anxiety than to have a policy adopted which may result in the death of many more boys?

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that it would be just as well to say that 20 Americans, or 50 Americans, were killed on the 14th of March or the 15th of March, and just give the number without the names? Would it not be just as valuable to the public as to publish a string of names, and would it not be advisable to leave the names out entirely?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I confess that to my uninformed judgment on the subject that would answer every purpose. But the general in charge of the Army over there says that it is all right to publish this other information.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very instructive and illuminating discussion, and I think it deserves a better audience. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. RUCKER.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were 7 ayes and 84 noes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Kreider	Roberts
Austin	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Rodenberg
Barkley	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Rowe
Black	Flynn	Lenroot	Rowland
Caldwell	Fordney	Lesher	Sanford
Campbell, Kans.	Foss	Litt page	Scott, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Freeman	Lufkin	Scully
Cantrill	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Sears
Capstick	Gallivan	McCormick	Siegel
Carew	Garland	McCulloch	Small
Carter, Mass.	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Goodall	McKeown	Steenerson
Clark, Pa.	Gould	McKinley	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Graham, Pa.	McLemore	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Hamill	Maher	Switzer
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Tague
Costello	Haugen	Mason	Talbott
Crago	Hayes	Meeker	Templeton
Crisp	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Treadway
Currie, Mich.	Heintz	Miller, Wash.	Van Dyke
Curry, Cal.	Holland	Morin	Vare
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Mott	Venable
Dies	Hood	Neely	Walker
Doelling	Husted	Nolan	Watson, Va.
Doremus	James	Parker, N. Y.	White, Ohio
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Drane	Jones, Va.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Drukker	Kahn	Platt	Winslow
Dunn	Kehoe	Porter	Woodyard
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Price	Zihlman
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	
Edmonds	Key, Ohio	Ratney	
Esch	Kraus	Riordan	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10358 and finding itself without a quorum, under the rule had caused the roll to be called, and 295 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he presented a list of the absentees to the House.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order was made the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] had the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 22, strike out the figures "\$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,000."

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a short time ago the committee saw fit to retain in the bill the provision for limiting the number of employees in the Bureau of Pensions, and to say that in vacancies occurring but 25 per cent should be appointed to fill the places vacated.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] offered an amendment to do away with that practice and to continue in the Bureau of Pensions a sufficient force to deal with the work done there. It was my privilege to read a letter at that time from the Bureau of Pensions, signed by the deputy commissioner, in which he very clearly set forth that one of the reasons why the work of the bureau was behind was on account of this system or practice that had been incorporated into law by the House three or four years ago. That is past history, however. I happen to be speaking just now to a greater number of men than were present in the Chamber a little while ago, and I am dealing with a related proposition. My amendment now is to increase the appropriation for the field force from \$90,000 to \$120,000, and I calculate that the increase of \$30,000 will provide about 20 extra men in the field. With that force we will do away with the revolting spectacle of worthy pensioners, both men and women, seeking what is theirs by right and frequently dying before relief is given to them by the Pension Bureau.

There is no question about it that men and women frequently die before these investigating men, who are charged with many and various duties, get around to their cases; and so we have the spectacle of the United States Government enacting a law asking people to submit their claims to the Pension Bureau in time, being told either directly or indirectly through their Congressmen, "Your case has been referred to a special investigator, and when he gets time your case will be taken up." Generally speaking, these people are very old; they are practically verging on the grave, waiting for the final summons, and in many instances, as I have said, by the time the investigator gets around there is *crêpe* hanging on the door. It amounts to this, that we want to put into the field a sufficient number of men so that there will not elapse, as there did elapse in a case in which I was personally interested not very long ago, one full year before the matter was disposed of. It is not the fault of the Bureau of Pensions; it is no fault of the Pension Commissioner; it is no fault of the force there. It is the fault of the piecayune policy of Congress. I wish to protest against that piecayune policy. These veterans may not have the same potential power now; they do not have so many votes perhaps, but their cause is just as sacred as ever [applause], and they are just as worthy of pensions as ever, and we should embrace this opportunity of providing a sufficient number of men to go out and do their work, not alone efficiently but promptly, in behalf of worthy men and women. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] will be adopted. Undoubtedly the work of the Pension Bureau is in arrears. The whole issue is whether responsibility should be placed upon the officials of the Pension Bureau or upon the Members of this House for failure to provide sufficient funds. I take it from the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island that the responsibility rests with the committee and with Congress. If that be true, then there is no question but that we should do something to relieve the situation. The gentleman from Rhode Island cites a case in his district where more than a year elapsed between the filing of the claim and the granting of the pension. I have had a great number of cases in my district where more than a year elapsed before the cases of widows of Civil War veterans could be adjudicated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman understand the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island to permit the employing of extra help down there?

Mr. KEATING. I understood his amendment is to increase the force in the field.

Mr. WALSH. It does not increase the force in the field; it simply increases the amount of per diem for subsistence.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to hear the gentleman express the views he has expressed, but I feel that I should say to him that the Committee on Appropriations determined that the Pension Office shall not have an adequate force.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to reflect upon the Committee on Appropriations, and I hesitate to believe that the committee would deprive the Pension Office of a sufficient force. But on this point there can be no doubt—the Pension Bureau is months and almost years behind its work. I can secure from the files of my office many, many letters from widows who filed their claims more than a year ago, and those claims have not been adjudicated. Many of these women are well known in the communities where they live, and there is no question about their right to a pension. I contend that these claims should be taken up and disposed of speedily.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman think the Pension Bureau ought to consider a widow's claim out of its order because of the fact that it has an inquiry from a Member of Congress respecting it?

Mr. KEATING. I hope the Pension Bureau will give some consideration to inquiries from Members of Congress. I have written some myself.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman kindly answer my particular question? We had here this morning a statement that there were some 60,000 letters received from Congressmen during the last year. It occurs to me that that alone would disrupt the Pension Bureau. Does the gentleman think that the Pension Bureau ought to consider a widow's claim out of its order because of the fact that a Member of Congress has inquired about it?

Mr. KEATING. No; unless the Member of Congress submits some good reason why it should do so. I think Members of Congress should be treated like other citizens of the United States.

Mr. SANFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. I can not believe that the letters written by Members of Congress have disrupted the Pension Bureau, and I submit it is up to the present Committee on Appropriations to prove that the present management of the Pension Office is inefficient or to grant a sufficient force to transact the business of that office.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not fair to assume that a large per cent, probably one-half, of those 60,000 letters that have gone to the bureau are inquiries about undue delays?

Mr. KEATING. I think that is true to a great extent. It has been my own experience.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I was misinformed. I asked the Clerk a little while ago, and my hurried reading of the paragraph led me to believe that the amendment would be applicable. I find that it is not. It merely provides for a per diem, and of course it would involve the offering of an amendment to the force in question. Now, there is in the bill no specific number of field men mentioned, and it would involve a study of the preceding paragraph on page 104 to work out the number who are available for this work.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I was employed for a good many years in that bureau and know something about its work. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment proposes to increase the allowance for per diem for the field men.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What I desired to do was to increase the number of men.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, the gentleman can accomplish that in effect by the amendment he is proposing. It would have that effect because they could detail, if they had a larger lump sum to pay this per diem, a larger number of clerks for the field work, and thus expedite it. If that is the purpose of the amendment it is all right.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. If it can be done, if the appropriation of \$120,000 instead of \$90,000 could be used for increasing the number of men upon field work, then I leave my amendment stand as it is and allow it to be answered by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. If it does what the gentleman from Kentucky suggests, the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Kentucky would have to wait more than 10 days to get an answer to their letters if they are going to detail a lot of their present clerks on field work.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I am willing to wait for answers to letters; but I want those people who put in definite, legitimate claims—

Mr. WALSH. The gentlemen were criticizing the bureau for not answering letters.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I did not criticize the bureau; I am criticizing Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY. No; it was not my intention, either, to criticize the bureau. I was merely showing that it is not up with its work, and that therefore its force should not be depleted now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Colorado had been here during the discussion upon the preceding paragraph he would have heard read a letter from

the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau, in which he stated that notwithstanding the fact that his force had been depleted 100 in number from what it was a year ago, on account of resignations of members of the force going into the military and other service, that by putting in better methods and cutting out, as he expressed it, the red tape, the bureau was keeping the regular work current. As to this particular amendment the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered, the amendment increases this appropriation from \$90,000 to \$120,000 for per diem in lieu of subsistence, for the men in the field who make examinations of these pension claims. They have 52 men now detailed for that particular purpose. The Pension Bureau has not asked for a single increase in the number now detailed, and if this committee undertakes to vote this increased appropriation, you are voting for something the Pension Bureau has not asked and does not desire. Now, as a matter of fact, the committee raised this appropriation from \$80,000 to \$90,000. It gave them an increase of \$10,000, and in addition to that allowed an increase of the per diem from \$3 to \$4 per day. So I repeat, gentlemen, that certainly in this day and in this time, when we are taxing the people as we are and when our Government is being put to an expense never before known in its history, we ought not to increase this appropriation \$30,000 when the Commissioner of Pensions himself has not asked us to do it and does not expect it. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman, I presume, will not question the correctness of the letter which I read to the committee a little while ago, in which the deputy commissioner states as follows—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yielded to a question. I did not yield for an argument.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. This is my question. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question. The deputy commissioner said this:

I beg to say, further, that the difficulties under which the bureau is laboring could be entirely removed if the 25 per cent limitation clause inserted in the appropriation act, and with relation to the Pension Bureau alone, were eliminated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That has no application to this amendment.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Let me read:

This would permit the appointment of such clerical help as is needed to keep the work more nearly current and to obviate those conditions which result from a restriction preventing the most effective adjustment of the force employed in the bureau to the labors to be performed in administering pension laws now in existence or which may hereafter be enacted.

Very truly, yours—

And so forth.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, the gentleman asks you to increase this appropriation \$30,000 in order to further decrease that clerical force and send it into the field, when the Commissioner of Pensions has not asked for it and does not say it is necessary.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield, if I have time.

Mr. TOWNER. Very reluctantly, evidently.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, not at all; I will gladly yield to the gentleman, as I always do.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice that the estimate of the department, which the gentleman says was not increased, is \$101,600. Upon what ground does the gentleman tell the committee that he has increased the appropriation rather than diminished it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why, the appropriation for the current year is \$80,000—

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And we have increased it to \$90,000.

Mr. TOWNER. I understood the gentleman to say you increased the estimate—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; we never increase estimates, I will say to the gentleman. We never allow to a department more than is asked, because it has been my observation and experience that a department never asks for a less sum than is actually needed and very frequently asks for a great deal more.

Mr. TOWNER. Why does the gentleman and the committee reduce the estimates of the department in this case? Ought they not to have at least made the amount what was estimated for, \$101,600, instead of \$90,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee, I will say to the gentleman, allowed \$10,000 increase, making \$90,000. The committee felt, not being asked for additional examiners in the field, that the bureau could get along and take care of the extra increase of per diem with this \$10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; first assistant commissioner, \$4,500; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk (who shall be qualified to act as principal examiners), \$3,000; 5 law examiners, at \$2,750 each; examiner of classification, \$3,600; 5 examiners in chief, at \$3,500 each; 2 examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each; examiners of trade-marks and designs—1 \$2,700, first assistant \$2,400, 6 assistants at \$1,500 each; examiners—45 principals at \$2,700 each, 90 first assistants at \$2,400 each, 90 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 90 third assistants at \$1,800 each, 90 fourth assistants at \$1,500 each; financial clerk, who shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of divisions, at \$1,800 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the commissioner, \$1,800; translator of languages, \$1,800; clerks—9 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 135 of class 1, 91 at \$1,000 each; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 90 copyists; 40 copyists, at \$720 each; 3 messengers (one transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 33 assistant messengers (two transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 13 laborers, at \$600 each (four transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 45 examiners' aids, at \$600 each; 24 copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I shall not ask the committee to return to the item on page 101, which provides for the force of the General Land Office, but I shall beg the indulgence of the committee to discuss that item for a few moments. I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber late Saturday afternoon when this item was reached, and therefore unable to discuss it at that time. I should not, however, have offered an amendment had I been here, as I realize that the committee would not accept without further consideration such an amendment as should be offered. But I do hope that if in the Senate this item shall be considerably modified, the number of clerks considerably increased, and the appropriation increased, the conferees representing the House will see their way clear to approve the increases which will be asked for.

The General Land Office is one of the old-established institutions of the Government. It has been growing for three-quarters of a century and more, and in the main the salaries paid in that office have not been much increased in more than 50 years. The result is that men in that office, having exceedingly important questions to pass upon, aggregating in the course of the year property values of hundreds of millions of dollars, receive salaries much lower than those paid to officials in other and newer bureaus of the Government whose duties are very much less onerous, trying, responsible, and important than those of the law clerks and law examiners of the Land Office.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office, one of the most efficient of all of our public servants, has for the past two years been endeavoring to secure an increase in the force of his office and some increases in the salaries of some of the officials of his bureau. He himself should receive an increase of at least a thousand dollars a year, but has not asked for it. I realize that the subcommittee having to do with all of the multiplied affairs of the Government, in all the executive departments provided for in this bill, can not be fully informed as to the needs of any one, much less all, of the bureaus of the Government.

I am, therefore, not criticizing the members of the committee or the subcommittee because the increase in clerks and the increases in salaries that the commissioner asked for have not been granted. I do, however, believe a careful consideration of the arguments made by the commissioner and all the facts he presented would have fully justified the committee in granting practically all he asked.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office asked for 26 additional clerks, with salaries of from \$1,000 to \$1,600, and amounting in the aggregate to \$32,400. In addition to this, he asked certain increases of from \$100 to \$500 in the salaries of some of the law clerks and examiners in his office. Had all the increases in clerical force and all the increases in salaries requested been granted, my opinion is that the commissioner would still be likely to be short of the necessary force to keep current the people's business coming before that office. Had he been granted the increases in salaries, those increases would not have brought the salaries of the men who would have been the beneficiaries of the increases as high as the salaries of men occupying corresponding positions in new bureaus by several hundred dollars per annum in any one case.

The commissioner made a very strong case before the committee I thought. I can see that the members of the subcommittee might not have realized the force of all the statements made, lacking, as they necessarily are, complete familiarity with the workings of the bureau. The Commissioner of the General Land Office is a very modest man—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. And while he stated his case clearly, possibly he did not state it with the vigor and vehemence that other gentlemen might, and therefore possibly the necessity and importance of these increases did not occur to the subcommittee. This is a part of what the commissioner said. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, asked the commissioner as to the condition and progress of work in his office, to which Mr. Tallman replied:

It is not in such good condition as it was a year ago.

Mr. BYRNS. How is it in volume as compared with a year ago?

Mr. TALLMAN. The volume of business has increased.

Mr. BYRNS. You mean without taking into consideration the work in connection with the stock-raising homestead act?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes; without taking that into consideration.

Then the commissioner went on to state the various causes for the increase of the work in his bureau. I shall not take the time to read two paragraphs in which he summed up in the main the important classes of work requiring additional help in the office. They appeal strongly to anyone familiar with public-land matters, and all of those from the West who know about these classes of increased business realize how they have been growing in the work of the office and how important they are. It might have been thought by some that the discussion held a few moments ago with regard to the working force of a certain office was from the standpoint of the interest of the clerks. I certainly have no such purpose of serving any individual's interest in what I am saying in regard to the Land Office. I am thinking only of the people's business—the people's business, which is efficiently handled in this bureau of the Government. No Member from the West has any special favors to ask of the General Land Office.

We simply desire to have the Land Office furnished with sufficient force, paid proper salaries, to secure that speedy, careful, faithful attention to the public business which is necessary. The commissioner made it very clear how a half dozen new pieces of legislation and a Supreme Court decision had very greatly increased the business of his office in the last year, without taking into consideration the new stock-raising homestead act. Now, how about that act? Here is what the commissioner said about it:

Now, the stock-raising homestead act is quite far-reaching; in fact, it is developing into the most important land legislation we have had for a good many years. I kept figures on it up to a few weeks ago, at which time there had been a total of over 60,000 entries, covering a gross area of some 24,000,000 acres. Now, that is 8,000,000 acres more than the total business of the year before in the shape of new business. I estimated for 26 clerks in the deficiency bill, thinking we would need them immediately. Fortunately we have not needed them so badly and will not until the appropriation we have under consideration comes into effect, for the reason that the entries under this stock-raising homestead act are not allowed until the land is designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

So, while we have gotten along, as it happens, fairly well without those 26 additional clerks, we will need all of them, and probably many more, to handle that business. I think 26 additional clerks will be sufficient to take up the work for the year and see how it turns out, and ascertain where we stand after working on it for a time.

The commissioner stated that very modestly. As a matter of fact, the business under the stock-raising homestead act alone in the year for which the appropriation in this bill provides will require a large additional force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the committee will indulge me for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Of the 26 clerks which the commissioner asked for, the committee allowed 8, a little less than one-third; 4 at \$1,200 and 4 at \$1,000. I am somewhat familiar with the business of the General Land Office, as every man from a Western land State is, and after careful inquiry and investigation I am of the opinion that every one of these 26 clerks is needed, needed badly, imperatively, if the public business is to be kept anything like current, if the business of the people is to be properly cared for.

One gentleman with whom I discussed this matter suggested that the war would make some difference in the Land Office business. That is true; but it makes this difference, that in the case of many classes of entries the war will greatly increase the business. Here is what the commissioner said of some of the classes of increases. There are others, some of them growing out of the war:

Mr. TALLMAN. One thing is the very large demand for certified copies of documents and the consequent necessity for searching and examining old records; another cause is new legislation, adding new forms of public-land business; and aside from that it is simply the current demand for public lands. You understand, the final proofs on entries made three and four years ago are just now coming in. The decision of the Supreme Court in what is known as the Deseret case released some 2,000,000 acres of suspended State indemnity selections for immediate adjudication. Much business has resulted from the building of the Alaska Railroad, particularly with respect to railroad town sites. Under the act of March 4, 1915, for the relief of desert-land entrymen, we have taken action on over 5,000 cases since the law was passed. The oil-land controversy, including the administration of contracts under the act of August 25, 1914, has required continuous attention by a considerable number of employees both in the office and in the field. The so-called "surface" acts, such as that of July 17, 1914, add complications to the matter of adjudication. Moreover, as a result of changed laws and policies and numerous withdrawals and restorations, it requires nearly double the work to adjudicate claims, as compared with some years ago. For example, irrigation under the desert act is now mostly by means of large projects; we examined and passed on 130 detailed engineers' reports of our field service on such projects last year. Our original entries, new business, shown in my annual report for last year—that is, for the year ending June 30, 1917—was over 16,000,000 acres of land entries, up to the average for recent years. That does not include any of the stock-raising business, you understand.

Mr. EVANS. That is due fundamentally to the desire of the people to acquire land?

Mr. TALLMAN. I should say so.

Mr. EVANS. And there is more contest work?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes, sir. The contest work has increased a little lately. It fell off a little during the last two or three years. It is running now in round numbers a little over 5,000 contests from which, in round numbers, 4,000 are cases of default or failure to prosecute or to appeal. For instance, in the oil business in California we have records come to us of hundreds of pages. Those cases involve literally millions of dollars. The same thing is occurring in the Wyoming oil cases. For instance, we had to handle this year and are handling now the Oregon-California land grant. There are 2,300,000 acres which we have to classify. The results of the field examinations all have to come to our office to be fully assembled, examined, and plotted. To do that we had to take the Oregon-California land grant and examine every tract of land that the railroad had ever received or could receive within the grant limits and ascertain from that every acre that the railroad might be entitled to, so as to close that grant. The amount of detail work on a proposition of that kind is very large. It keeps several people working on it all the time. Now, we are getting that classification under way. By next spring we have to furnish the public information as to what was shown by that classification and examination and open those lands to entry. At the same time we have got to prepare schedules showing our cruises of all the timber we have to dispose of and conduct the sales. All of that work has to be done in our office. Under many acts we have to do much original work in the nature of working out the governmental policy. For instance, Congress recently passed a law, the potash-leasing bill, with which you are familiar. It was a very general bill and gave the department very large authority. It is necessary to work out that whole scheme of procedure practically and to consider all of the technical and legal propositions that arise in connection with working out that plan. The same was true as to the leasing of Alaska coal lands.

The war, instead of decreasing the business in the General Land Office, has very considerably increased it; and, in addition to that, very few days pass without some new land legislation, all of which lays a new burden and an additional requirement on the General Land Office. As the public-land area decreases the amount of work connected with entries increases, for we are multiplying the classes of entries, we are constantly making new requirements in regard to almost all classes of entries, we are scrutinizing all classes of entries more carefully than in the past.

This public-land service is one of the most valuable under the flag. It is a service rendered to the pioneers who are developing the undeveloped resources of the country, making two blades of grass grow where one or none grew before, opening rich veins and fountains of mineral wealth, bringing fructifying waters from the mountain streams over the arid wastes, and making them blossom as the rose.

Mr. WALSH rose.

Mr. MONDELL. The public-land service is a service which has aided in creating great Commonwealths amid the mountains and on the desert plains, vastly increasing the wealth of the Nation, and establishing new and flourishing communities in the glorious and golden West. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I rose some little time ago to ask the gentleman to yield, but I was so charmed by his eloquence that I could not prefer the request. The gentleman is an expert upon this particular sort of legislation and probably the best-posted man in the House upon public-land matters.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any scheme or plan which is in operation or which may be

put in operation whereby these public lands will at some time or other be turned over to the various States, for them to assume the burden of jurisdiction over them, and thus relieve the General Government of this supervision, which has been exercised for many years?

Mr. MONDELL. The plan and purpose of State ownership has been suggested and promoted at one time and another, but never very successfully.

The western people have never been a unit on the matter, and Congress has never shown any considerable disposition to enact the legislation. There are many people in the West who would be willing to assume the burden.

Mr. WALSH. There is no existing law for it?

Mr. MONDELL. There is not.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, as a new paragraph, to be inserted at the end of line 6 on page 107.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUCKER offers the following amendment: Insert as a new paragraph, following line 6 on page 107, the following:

"Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Patent Office not actually filled June 30, 1918, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure, but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any position with a salary of \$2,250 or above that sum."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, or I will reserve it if the gentleman desires me to—

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, let the gentleman make his point of order. I am not asking any favors.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. RUCKER. What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That it is legislation, and that it can not come under the Holman rule, which retrenches expenditures. There are no vacancies in the Patent Office, such as exist in the Pension Bureau, and therefore it is an entirely different proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical in language with a paragraph found in the bill in another place. If it should be adopted, and there should be three deaths of clerks in the Patent Office, would there not be a saving of money, because it would save three clerks, and one could not be appointed until there were four vacancies? You would have to kill four before one could be appointed. This is the same point that was before the Chair a day or two ago and, I think, the same identical question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will note in that case the Chair particularly inquired, before ruling, whether there were any existing vacancies, and the answer was that there were existing vacancies.

Mr. RUCKER. That answer did not come from me.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it came from the chairman of the committee, based upon the evidence submitted to the committee. The vacancies, as the Chair understood, were of record, and undisputed. The Chair will further call attention to the fact that the amendment proposed presents an entirely different situation from the one heretofore ruled upon. It may be very likely, indeed highly probable, in the light of experience that there will be vacancies during the time to which the amendment relates. But that is a purely speculative proposition. In the case referred to there were actual existing vacancies which could not be filled, provided the paragraph remained in the bill. The retention of that paragraph kept those vacancies from being filled, and that result was, in effect, a reduction of existing employees of the Government, and of official salaries. That reduction brought the paragraph within the benefit of the Holman rule. But the case in hand, is as stated, a speculative proposition. There may be vacancies hereafter arising. It is highly probable that these vacancies will occur, but that is as far as we can go. The Chair can not say, that there is a moral certainty that these vacancies will take place, and unless it is a moral certainty that they will occur, thereby taking that occurrence out of the domain of speculation, the amendment proposed will not operate ex proprio vigore, to reduce expenditures. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules let me say that I am not advised, and therefore will not make a statement to the Chair, with reference to whether there are vacancies

there or not. Before we reach another bureau I think I will have the opportunity to find out, and then I will offer this amendment again. For the present I withdraw the amendment, and I move now to amend, on page 107, line 4, by striking out "\$600" and inserting "\$750."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to withdraw the amendment which was read?

Mr. RUCKER. I have tried to withdraw it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RUCKER: Page 107, line 4, strike out "\$600" and insert "\$750."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am not going to trespass upon the time of this committee and therefore will not ask any extension of time. It might be objectionable to some gentlemen to grant me an extension. I do not want to be interrupted during the few minutes I shall occupy the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when I was not much in favor of the amendment that has just been offered, and which, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee, was not allowed to be acted upon. Really I had no confidence in its wisdom until recently. I have been converted to the idea that perhaps the limitation upon the appropriations for the Pension Bureau may have some merit. My good friend, the genial gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I am sure by his solemn and impressive manner impressed upon the minds of the occupants of the galleries that he enjoys some ministerial connection; and I am sure everyone was impressed when they heard the deep pathos of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], who pleaded his devotion to the soldier whose affairs are attended to in the Pension Bureau; and then the gallant, distinguished, and oratorical gentleman who talked with vim and vigor and almost ferocious eloquence. I am sure he and they succeeded in convincing this committee that the very wise provision they wrote into this bill ought by right to remain in the bill, because the Committee of the Whole voted down my amendment to strike it out. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was not willing to let the committee express its judgment on the propriety of making the same identical limitation apply to other Government bureaus. His very actions, to my mind, condemn the language, and I fully understand why he does not want to thus hamper and cripple other bureaus. But I offered, gentlemen, at the end of another paragraph, their own language, language which they incubated upon, if that is the proper word. [Laughter.] I withdraw it. No; it was hatched by the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency and given to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know the gentleman does not want to do any injustice to the committee nor to the Bureau of Efficiency. I will say, as I have said before, that the Bureau of Efficiency had absolutely nothing to do with suggesting, preparing, or even intimating this provision.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to be interrupted very long or very often by the gentleman because he can get more time than I can.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that it is a singular circumstance that when I pleaded with the gentleman in the most pathetic language I could command to tell us if there was a single other bureau in the Government that is handicapped like this, and although I called his attention to it again while he was on the floor, he refused to answer. I appealed to the gentleman from Iowa, and he promptly denied me the courtesy of a reply and refused to answer. I applied to the loquacious gentleman from Wisconsin who always has an answer for everything and for every one, whether right or wrong—most of the time wrong—and he was so busy talking about something else that he said he could not yield in five minutes, though he knew that he had plenty of time and could get plenty more if he desired it. [Laughter.] These gentlemen could not answer the question without betraying conditions for which this House would not stand. If I had them before an ordinary jury and could compel responses, I think I could develop some facts which would not justify the action of which I complain.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you, in the light of all that has been said, why should not this limitation be placed upon the appropriations for every bureau of the Government if it is placed against one? I seriously doubt if the policy that has been pursued is a wise policy. We are allowing gentlemen who have

grasping dispositions to usurp too much power in the House; and when you undertake to bring people in here to outvote them, the gentlemen resort to all sorts of tactics, even to calling for tellers, in order to make delay in the transaction of the public business; and the gentleman from Iowa seems to have locomotor ataxia and can not walk at all. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 107, line 5, after the word "each," strike out the words "who shall be selected without regard to apportionment."

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment for the purpose of eliciting from the chairman of the committee the reason for this singular provision in the bill that takes out of the classified service the apportionment between the States of 950 employees drawing salaries annually of \$1,416,500. Why is it that they are not to be apportioned among the various States like other employees of the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read the paragraph, he will notice that the language applies only to 24 copy pullers, at \$480 each.

Mr. ROBBINS. The paragraph does not limit it to that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBBINS. How do you make it appear that way? If that is true, I do not wish to urge my amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will observe the punctuation, he will readily see that it applies only to 24 copy pullers.

Mr. ROBBINS. The paragraph is divided by semicolons all the way through, and that limitation does not apply only to the last four employees, to wit, the copy pullers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will notice the semicolon, and then follows this language: "Twenty-four copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500." I think if the gentleman will examine it closely, he must come to the conclusion that the language to which he objects applies only to the 24 copy pullers. I will say that that was put in upon the request and insistence of the Commissioner of Patents, who said that these copy pullers are boys and that it is impossible to get boys to come here from the States and accept a position at \$480. For that reason he asked that the apportionment be waived with reference to these 24 boys, known as copy pullers, so that he could get them in the District of Columbia. The committee felt that under the circumstances the request ought to be granted.

Mr. ROBBINS. To clarify it you ought to insert "which last-mentioned employees shall be selected without regard to apportionment."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is the slightest trouble about the paragraph as it reads; that would simply encumber the bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. There ought to be cleared up now what is ambiguous. You begin at the bottom of page 106, and each class of these employees is set off by a semicolon. It runs right along and there are 45 "examiners' aids," at \$600 each; and then "24 copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500."

Where is the limitation that fixes it, so that all of these employees enumerated in this section will not be entitled to be relieved of the restriction of "apportionment" now applied under the civil-service law to these employees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I just tried to explain to the gentleman that it is contained within those semicolons.

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not so understand it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a very profound intellectual controversy going on here about the construction of this legislation, and I think we ought to have the help of more Members. I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. RUCKER to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 13, noes 47.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote discloses the lack of a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Fairchild, R. L.	Key, Ohio	Robinson
Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Kraus	Rodenberg
Bankhead	Fess	Kreider	Rowe
Bland	Fields	La Follette	Rowland
Brodbeck	Flynn	LaGuardia	Sabath
Buchanan	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, N. Y.
Butler	Foss	Lenroot	Sanford
Caldwell	Freeman	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Fuller, Mass.	McCormick	Scully
Cantrill	Gallivan	McCulloch	Sears
Capstick	Garland	McFadden	Sells
Carew	Glass	McKenzie	Small
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	McKeown	Smith, C. B.
Church	Gould	McKinley	Smith, T. F.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Madden	Snyder
Clark, N. J.	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Greene, Vt.	Meeker	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Sullivan
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Costello	Harrison, Va.	Morin	Talbot
Crago	Hayden	Mott	Templeton
Crisp	Heaton	Mudd	Treadway
Curry, Mich.	Heintz	Neely	Van Dyke
Curry, Cal.	Holland	Norton	Vare
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Dies	Hood	Peters	Walker
Doelling	Howard	Phelan	Watson, Va.
Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Platt	White, Ohio
Drane	Husted	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Drukker	James	Pou	Wilson, La.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Powers	Winslow
Eagan	Jones, Va.	Ragsdale	Wise
Eagle	Kahn	Rahney	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	Woodyard
Estepinal	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Zihlman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative appropriation bill, and finding itself without a quorum, had directed the roll to be called, when 289 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the names of the absentees for publication in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 107, line 4, after the word "pullers," strike out "at \$480 each" and insert after the word "apportionment," in line 5, the words "at \$480 each."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of building for the Civil Service Commission, \$16,875.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an inquiry. Why is the Civil Service Commission in this item in the bill? Do they not occupy a building that is constructed by the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; they do not. They have a five-year lease of a building they occupy on F Street, and this is the contract price.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Office, Postmaster General: Postmaster General, \$12,000; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, \$4,000; private secretary, \$2,500; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, assistant to chief clerk, confidential clerk to Postmaster General, and chairman, board of inspection, at \$2,000 each; chief inspector, \$4,000; chief clerk to chief inspector, \$2,000; purchasing agent, \$4,000; chief clerk to purchasing agent, \$2,000; assistant attorneys—1 \$3,000, 1 \$2,500; 3 at \$2,000 each; bond examiner, \$2,500; law clerk, \$1,800; clerks—86 of class 4, 130 of class 3, 200 of class 2, 246 of class 1. 183 at \$1,000 each, 31 at \$900 each; skilled draftsmen—3 at \$1,800 each, 8 at \$1,600 each, 5 at \$1,400 each, 8 at \$1,200 each; map mounter, \$1,200; assistant map mounter, \$1,000; blue printer, \$900; assistant blue printer, \$840; telegrapher, \$1,500; typewriter repairer, \$1,200; 3 telephone switchboard operators; 2 messengers in charge of mails at \$900 each; 22 messengers; 35 assistant messengers; captain of the watch, \$1,200; additional to 3 watchmen acting as lieutenant of watchmen, at \$120 each; 34 watchmen; 2 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 9 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 2 blacksmiths or steamfitters, at \$1,000 each; 3 oilers, at \$840 each; 15 firemen; 20 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; chief engineer, \$1,600; assistant electricians—2 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; carpenters—1 \$1,400, 3 at \$1,000 each; awning maker, painter, and plumber, at \$1,000 each; assistant plumber, \$900; laborers—foreman \$900, assistant foreman \$840, 2 at \$840 each, 76 at \$720 each, 3 at \$660 each; female laborers—1 \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 9 at \$480 each; 58 charwomen; actual and necessary expenses of the purchasing agent while traveling on business of the department, \$500; in all, \$1,459,690.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to the item in line 17, page 118. What is the pay the 58 charwomen get in salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They get \$240 a year, the customary salary.

Mr. LOBECK. Two hundred and forty dollars a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Two hundred and forty dollars a year, \$20 a month. That is the statutory salary paid to charwomen.

Mr. LOBECK. Oh, no; they are paying in the Treasury Department more than that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What is that?

Mr. LOBECK. They are paying more in the Treasury Department. The custodians of these same buildings are paying more money than that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Only in case where they are working all day, but not where they are working as these do from two not to exceed three hours in the evening or early in the morning in cleaning up the rooms.

Mr. LOBECK. Does the gentleman mean to say they only work two or three hours?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is about all; about two or three hours; just as the charwomen in the House Office Building do, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LOBECK. But where they are working four or five hours they are getting more pay than that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand these women work two or three hours a day.

Mr. LOBECK. Well, the women in the Federal buildings under the direction of the Treasury Department, also in the Post Office Buildings are getting at the present time \$25 a month. In New York City they are getting \$325 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBECK. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. For how many hours a day do they work?

Mr. LOBECK. They are supposed to work between four and five hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, even those in this instance where they are apparently receiving a higher compensation are not receiving proportionately as much as we are paying them here in the District. The testimony in the hearings of various chief clerks of whom we have asked, and we have asked several chief clerks, who have charge usually of the employment of these charwomen, that the time of the employment was usually two or three hours, rarely three, generally two to two and a half hours on the average.

Mr. LOBECK. I looked over the hearings, and I did not find anything in the hearings bearing on the subject.

I find in the payment of salaries of laborers in the Post Office Department they are paid \$70 a month. In the Treasury Department they are paying \$50 to \$55 for the same service—that is, this Government is—we are paying for the women who are acting as charwomen in the Treasury Department in the same building, doing the same kind of work, and working the same hours as in the Post Office Department at the rate of \$25 a month. There is a bill now before Congress to increase that pay to \$35 a month for the women, instead of \$25. I think \$20 a month is too small a wage, and if it were proper to add an amendment—although I am afraid it would go out on the point of order—to increase the wages, I would do so; but I think it is wrong to pay these women—I do not care whether they work two or three hours in a day mopping the floors and cleaning up—only \$20 per month, and most of these people have to pay car fare.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Are these women who get this small compensation for the two or three hours' work employed in any other department so that they work continuously all day long?

Mr. LOBECK. I do not think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are instances, if the gentleman will permit, where charwomen employed in one department in the early morning are employed at another department late in the evening or in the early evening hours.

Mr. HICKS. It practically makes continuous labor?

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony is that most of this labor is performed by women who are heads of families. They go to the departments in the early hours and return home in time to arrange matters in the home, the cooking and the like.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOBECK. Do they not return in the evening and finish the work they started in the morning?

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony is that these women either come in the early morning or in the afternoon. If they perform service during the entire day of six hours, their compensation as fixed in this bill is \$480, which is double that for the two and three hour period, for which we pay them \$240.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman from Nebraska permit me to interrogate the gentleman from Wisconsin in his time?

Mr. LOBECK. I will.

Mr. HICKS. Do I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin to say that these women have practically continuous service throughout the day?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. So far as I have been able to glean from the testimony, they are employed only once a day for two or three hours and then return home and perform their duties there. There are instances, however, where some charwomen are employed in two different departments, in two different shifts, for which they receive double the salary, or \$480.

Mr. HICKS. That is, for two shifts?

Mr. LOBECK. Do they receive pay in one department first and then in another?

Mr. STAFFORD. Exactly.

Mr. LOBECK. I have looked for the testimony in the hearings, but was not able to find it. I am glad to get the information.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would permit me to state my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this section because there are two or three items in it that are raises of salary. Of course, this committee had originally no jurisdiction to legislate, but they have done so. But the question of jurisdiction was not made. But under the rules they can not legislate in an appropriation bill. I think the point of order can be well sustained to the words "\$3,000," on line 18, page 117, and on two or three smaller items that I do not care to make the point of order on.

Now, the increase here is very small, and it might have gone by unnoticed, but I desire to direct the attention of the House to the policy that is involved in this matter. This committee can not legislate. It ought not to undertake to raise salaries in this bill. It has no power to do that. But I realize, further, the fact that the Committee on Appropriations itself is not so much to blame when the representatives of the Post Office Department go before it and seek an increase of the salaries of officers in that department.

Now, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has authority, and it is the only committee that has, to legislate for that department. It legislates not only for the Postal Service but for the departmental service, and while it is true that this committee may appropriate for departmental service but not for the Postal Service, yet it must appropriate in accordance with existing law. The representatives, as I said, of the Post Office Department go to the committee and ask for these increases, however.

They ought to go to the committee that is provided by law to determine them, and if they go there and do not get them they ought not to circumvent the jurisdiction of the committee that has control of legislation in reference to the Post Office Department by bringing the question again—or for the first time, as it may be—before the Appropriations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee ought not to submit to such a request. It puts the Post Office Department in bad attitude in reference to legislation, both as to the two committees and as to the House, and it ought to be rebuked. And while I do not know the officer who is getting a little increase of \$250, and while that may not amount to very much, and it may be that it is due him, the place for him to get that increase under the law, if he is entitled to it, is before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, in my judgment. Therefore I make the point of order on the words that I have read.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the point of order which I understand the gentleman to make is directed to an increase of salary of the assistant solicitor from \$2,750 to \$3,000. The point of order is unquestionably good. I am very glad indeed to know that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon]

has had a change of heart in regard to legislation on appropriation bills, for I think if the record is investigated it will be found that a year ago when the Post Office appropriation bill was presented to this Congress, coming from his committee and under his charge, it contained more legislation upon an appropriation bill than any other appropriation bill that has been introduced in this House since I have been a Member of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, in justice to the committee: The Postmaster General has been making a reorganization of his department ever since he has been Postmaster General. He has done that with the result of reducing the number of employees in his department by 189 persons, drawing salaries aggregating \$174,360. In other words, the Postmaster General—

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will excuse me, I will make this statement.

Mr. RUCKER. I will excuse you.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In other words, the action of the Postmaster General along this line has resulted in the saving in that one department alone of \$174,360 every year.

Now, the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, under the recommendation and the estimate submitted by the Postmaster General, reduces the number of employees in that department by 37, their aggregate salaries amounting to \$28,120.

Now, the Postmaster General came before the committee with that sort of a record and that sort of a statement, and the statement was made that this assistant solicitor had increased work, and that he acted as solicitor in the absence of the chief solicitor. In addition to that, it was shown that even before the war started there was a considerable natural growth in the volume and importance of the work of the legal officer for the Post Office Department, on account of the necessity for considering cases relating to lotteries and the misuse of the mails in the furtherance of schemes to defraud the public. Since the war, added responsibilities have been imposed upon the office of the solicitor, involving the administration of certain provisions of the espionage and trading with the enemy acts. This particular assistant attorney is doing a great deal of that work.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is well taken, but this increase is well deserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] makes the point of—

Mr. MOON. One moment, Mr. Chairman, there is another point of order to be made here. We have not done with this yet. On page 118, line 1, are the words "telegrapher, \$1,500."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to my friend from Tennessee, I want to say this: Suppose it were true that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads did bring in a bill that had an immense amount of legislation on it. That is no justification for this action. That is begging the question. But the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, when it brought a bill into this House, has had the candor to say to this House, "This is new legislation and is subject to a point of order," at the beginning or else it has asked, in accordance with the rule, for a special rule to make it in order.

The gentleman says there has been great economy effected. Suppose there has been. The gentleman does not insist for a moment that the raising of salaries above what they were in any way contributed to that economy. That was the work of the department, without any intervention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. The objection I make—and it is one that I think the House ought to well consider—is that these department officials, when they can not get what they want before the proper committee, have no right to go to another committee. They might in this instance just as well have gone to the Committee on Labor or to the Committee on Acoustics as to have gone to this committee. It is a bad practice and we ought to have a rule in this House, if I may be permitted to say it, that will require some respect to be paid to the judgment of this House and its constituted committees.

I am not speaking of the Post Office Department especially, but the practice of all these departments is that when they can not get what they want in one place—in the House—they go to another place, and if they can not get it in the House, they go to the Senate and get it from friendly conferees, finally, and the judgment of this House is thus overridden. There ought to be some rule in this House to protect us in legislation, and it is no part of the functions of this committee to participate in the usurpation of power and authority that belongs to another committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reference to this particular item for a telegrapher at \$1,500, the salary heretofore was \$1,400. It is proper, perhaps, to raise it to \$1,500. I do not know. If the

gentleman insists upon it, I will withdraw the point of order if he thinks the whole interests of the Republic rest upon this increase by his committee of \$100 to a salary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman wants to make the point of order on this man getting \$100 increase, he can make it. The committee unanimously felt that in all justice and fairness he ought to have this slight increase.

Mr. MOON. Well, if the gentleman is defiant about it, I will make the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is sustained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members were answered to their names:

Anderson	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Reed
Anthony	Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan
Bacharach	Elliott	Key, Ohio	Roberts
Bankhead	Ellsworth	Knutson	Rodenberg
Barnhart	Estepinal	Kraus	Rowe
Beauregard	Evans	Kreider	Rowland
Boehmer	Fairchild, B. L.	La Follette	Sanders, La.
Borland	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Sauford
Brand	Ferris	Lazaro	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Pa.
Buchanan	Fields	Lenroot	Scully
Butler	Flynn	Longworth	Sears
Campbell, Kans.	Focht	McClintic	Sherwood
Campbell, Pa.	Foss	McCormick	Shouse
Cantrill	Frear	McCulloch	Shayden
Capstick	Fuller, Mass.	McFadden	Slomp
Carew	Gallivan	McKenzie	Small
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	McKeown	Smith, Thomas F.
Church	Garland	McKinley	Snell
Clark, Fla.	Garner	McLemore	Snyder
Clark, Pa.	Gillett	Madden	Stedman
Claypool	Good	Magee	Steele
Coady	Goodall	Mann	Steenerson
Collier	Gould	Martin	Stephens, Nebr.
Connely, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Gray, N. J.	Meeker	Sullivan
Copley	Gregg	Miller, Minn.	Switzer
Costello	Hamill	Morin	Talbott
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Templeton
Cramton	Hamlin	Mudd	Thompson
Crisp	Harrison, Miss.	Nelson	Towner
Currie, Mich.	Hastings	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Curry, Cal.	Heaton	Oldfield	Van Dyke
Davidson	Heflin	Padgett	Vare
Dempsey	Helntz	Palge	Walker
Denison	Holland	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dewalt	Hollingsworth	Peters	Watson, Va.
Dies	Hood	Phelan	Webb
Doelling	Houston	Platt	White, Ohio
Doellittle	Howard	Polk	Williams
Doremus	Husted	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Izce	Pou	Wilson, La.
Drane	James	Powers	Wise
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Jones, Va.	Purnell	Woods, Iowa
Dupré	Juni	Raessdale	Woodyard
Eagan	Kahn	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
	Kehoe	Rayburn	Zibelman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, H. R. 10358, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 237 Members answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and Record.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer in line 18, page 117, to insert the figures "\$2,750" after the first word "one."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand where that comes in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 117, line 18, after the first word "one," insert "\$2,750."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MOON. I reserve a point of order on the amendment for the purpose of asking my colleague if he recollects whether \$2,750 is the amount fixed by the general law for this salary, or was that an increase on an appropriation bill over and above the original amount fixed by the general law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the amount fixed by act of Congress passed March 4, 1915.

Mr. MOON. A general statute?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if that restores the figures of last year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As in the preceding case?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. RUCKER), there were—ayes 70, noes none.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 118, after the word "telegrapher," in the first line, I move to insert the figures "\$1,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 118, line 1, after the word "telegrapher," insert "\$1,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In making readjustments hereunder the salary of any clerk in any class may be fixed by the Postmaster General at \$100 below the salary fixed by law for such class, and the unused portion of such salary shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class. The Postmaster General shall assign to the several bureaus, offices, and divisions of the Post Office Department such number of the employees herein authorized as may be necessary to perform the work required therein; and he shall submit a statement showing such assignments and the number employed at the various salaries in the annual Book of Estimates following the estimates for salaries in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if that section is not new law, beginning with line 21, on page 18, and ending with the word "class," in line 1, on page 119?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I think the first sentence of the paragraph is clearly subject to a point of order. It was inserted at the instance of the Postmaster General for the first time in the legislative bill last year, so as to enable the Postmaster General to promote or demote a clerk \$100 at a time instead of \$200. He made the statement that in some cases a clerk would not be entitled under his efficiency rating to a \$200 increase, but he would be entitled to a \$100 increase; or in some cases he could make two promotions of \$100 each instead of leaving one clerk at his old salary and promoting another clerk, no more competent, \$200. For that reason he felt that in justice to the employees of the department he ought to have that authority, and the committee inserted it in the bill last year for the first time. There was no objection made to it at that time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I think the place for the Postmaster General to go to get laws passed in reference to his department is before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and not to these other committees. I make the point of order on lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 118, and on line 1, on page 119, down to and including the word "class."

The CHAIRMAN. Has the chairman of the committee anything to say on that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General: Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; division of rural mails—superintendent \$3,000, chief clerk \$2,000; division of equipment and supplies—superintendent \$3,000, chief clerk \$2,000; topographer, \$2,400; in all, \$19,900.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "two thousand dollars," line 16, page 120.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will state that that really is a reduction of expenses of this department. There were formerly fixed by statute a division of supplies, with a superintendent at \$2,750, and a division of equipment, with a superintendent at \$2,750. The statute created two divisions and fixed the salary of the two superintendents at \$2,750 each. Under the reorganization the Postmaster General has provided for a division of equipment and supplies, with one superintendent, at \$3,000, which is a reduction of one salary and a rise, of course, of \$250 to the man who takes both divisions.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And one of the most obliging officials in the Post Office Department, Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have been so assured, and in view of the fact that the duties are doubled, looking out for two divisions, the Postmaster General felt that he was entitled to the modest increase of \$250, and by that reduction we save \$2,500 to the Government.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, by making a reduction of a few dozen other matters they might save \$25,000 more. The question is, Is this legislation in this bill? The statute provides \$2,750 for the superintendent, and it does not provide for \$3,000. This is one separate and distinct proposition, not connected with anything else. There is nothing on the face of this bill to show that there are any dual duties performed. It is simply proposed to raise the salary from \$2,750 to \$3,000.

Now, I do not care about the amount of salary; that is insignificant. But the idea is that the adjustment of these matters ought to go to the proper committee.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am persuaded by what the gentleman from Tennessee has said that this really is in the interest of economy. This is one of the most efficient men in the Post Office Department, and if the gentleman had a district like mine, requiring the work that is done there, he would so view it.

Mr. MOON. Where is this gentleman from?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know, he is always there. He is not from anywhere. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. Is he from Missouri?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no; I think he is from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. I have made the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and if the gentleman insists on it, it is not very material. I wanted to show to the House that legislation of this sort ought not to be encouraged, but in view of the solicitation of the gentleman from Missouri, and in deference to my friend from Tennessee, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have thus far made so many improvements in the bill that I am thoroughly satisfied with it now. I added some very desirable amendments to it myself and therefore if the gentlemen of the committee do not need my assistance any longer I am going to my office. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How long does the gentleman from Tennessee plan to sit to-night?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, we want to read 8 or 10 more pages. There are no controverted questions and it will only take a very few minutes. If the gentleman will permit us to get down to a point where we can consider the bill in one more day. The gentleman knows that we have not had an opportunity to read any considerable portion of the bill to-day, and I hope the gentleman will bear with us a few minutes longer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That surely has been no fault of this side. The gentleman, I understand, proposes to ask to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow, and it might be well to have the day start in in good humor. Gentlemen have been here all day.

Mr. SHERLEY. These 10 pages will probably be read in 10 minutes. We are not going to get into any controverted matters late to-night.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I suggest that they read up to the Department of Justice.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to read as far as the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman indicate how long he intends to run?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that if the committee remains in good humor the reading will be completed very soon. The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Post Office Department: For stationery and blank books, index and guide cards, folders, and binding devices, including purchase of free penalty envelopes, \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in the spelling of the word "department," in line 19, page 120.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word will be spelled correctly.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for official use of the Postmaster General to cost not exceeding \$4,000; purchase and exchange of a motor truck; maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle and of motor trucks, to be used only for official purposes, and garage rent, \$7,500.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this to ask the chairman the purpose of the use of this, and if this is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think it is new legislation; I do not think it is subject to a point of order. I will say to the gentleman that the purpose of this paragraph is to au-

thorize the purchase of an automobile for the official use of the Postmaster General. All Cabinet members are now provided with four horses and from two to four carriages, and the committee has made a thorough investigation and has come to the conclusion that it is a matter of economy to have an automobile instead of the horses. These horses cost from \$30 to \$35 a month each for board, in addition to the stable hire, and the repairs to the carriages, and the cost mounts up. The gentleman will recall that a year ago an automobile was authorized for the Secretary of State, and that automobile was purchased under the same terms provided here for the Postmaster General—and which I may say to the gentleman that has been done for all other Cabinet officials—and the actual facts show, as reported by the chief clerk of the Department of State, that the automobile has cost \$1,000 less to the Government during the year than the horses and carriages.

Mr. ROBBINS. Which automobile saved that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The automobile purchased by the Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBBINS. And now it is proposed to purchase one for the Postmaster General for that reason, is it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. And I may say to the gentleman that we have already provided automobiles in this bill for the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, and those items have been passed without objection.

Mr. WALSH. But they are not all of the time preaching economy.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I want to say this in justice to the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General stated to the committee, through his chief clerk, that he did not want an automobile. He said that he preferred the use of the carriage and horses. Later on he came to the committee room and stated that he had been informed by another Cabinet officer that it was the opinion of the committee that money could be saved. Then he said, "While my personal preference is for my horses, yet if the committee thinks that it can save one dollar to the Government, give me an automobile and take my horses and carriages from me."

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think by expending \$4,000 for an automobile that the Government is going to save money?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no question about the matter of saving, if the gentleman will look into it.

Mr. WALSH. Does it cost \$4,000 to keep that span of horses?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Those horses will be sold. Their upkeep will cost much more than the automobile will cost.

Mr. ROBBINS. Who owns the horses and carriages now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Government owns the horses and carriages. Let me say to the gentleman that it costs from \$30 to \$35 a month to board each one of those four horses. It cost nearly \$2,600 last year to maintain the horses and carriages and expenses incident thereto of the Postmaster General. Does the gentleman think that it will cost \$2,600 to maintain an automobile?

Mr. ROBBINS. If it costs \$2,600 to maintain the horses, what will it cost to buy gasoline and hire a couple of chauffeurs?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The \$2,600 does not take into consideration the cost of the drivers. It is simply the board of the horses and the cost of maintaining the vehicles, and purchasing horses when needed to take the places of those which die or become worthless.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think \$2,600 is entirely too much to contribute to the mere board of horses.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that it costs a great deal to board horses now, and the statement was made to the committee—

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee want to move to rise?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think we ought to have some understanding about finishing this bill.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves that the committee rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. NORTON) there were—yeas 40, noes 39.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Tellers, Mr. Chairman. Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. NORTON] reported that there were—ayes 32, noes 46.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 32, the noes are 46, a quorum is not present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Fairchild, B. L.	Kitchin	Robinson
Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Knutson	Rosenberg
Ayres	Ferris	Kraus	Rouse
Bacharach	Fess	Kroder	Rowe
Bankhead	Fields	La Follette	Rowland
Barkley	Fisher	LatGuardia	Rucker
Barnhart	Flynn	Lazaro	Russell
Beckes	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, La.
Bell	Fordney	Leandro	Sanford
Blackmon	Foss	Lever	Schall
Borland	Frear	Linthicum	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Freeman	Little	Scott, Pa.
Browne	Fuller, Ill.	Loneragan	Scully
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Sears
Buchanan	Gallagher	Lunn	Sells
Burnett	Gallivan	McClintic	Shallenberger
Butler	Gard	McCormick	Sherwood
Byrnes, S. C.	Garland	McCulloch	Shouse
Caldwell	Garner	McFadden	Sims
Campbell, Kans.	Gillett	McKenzie	Slayden
Campbell, Pa.	Good	McKeown	Small
Cantrill	Goodall	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Capstick	Gough	McLemore	Smith, C. B.
Car, W.	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Carter, Mass.	Graham, Pa.	Magee	Snell
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Snyder
Church	Green, Iowa	Martin	Stedman
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Mason	Steele
Clark, Pa.	Hamill	Mays	Steenerson
Clason	Hamilton, Mich.	Meeker	Stephens, Miss.
Claypool	Hamilton, N. Y.	Merritt	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Hamlin	Miller, Minn.	Sterling, Pa.
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Mondell	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Harrison, Miss.	Montague	Stiness
Cooper, Wis.	Horton	Morin	Sullivan
Coppy	Hunt	Mott	Switzer
Costello	Heintz	Nelson	Talbott
Crago	Housley	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Hersey	Nolan	Temple
Crisp	Hicks	Oldfield	Templeton
Curtis, Mich.	Holland	Olney	Thompson
Curry, Cal.	Hollingsworth	O'Shaunnessy	Townner
Davidson	Hood	Owmyer	Treadway
Dempsey	Houston	Padgett	Var
Dent	Howard	Paice	Walker
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Park	Walton
Dickinson	Hull, Tenn.	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dies	Husted	Peters	Watson, Va.
Doelling	James	Phelan	Weaver
Doollittle	Johnson, Ky.	Platt	Webb
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polk	Whaley
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	White, Ohio
Drukner	Jones, Va.	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Juhl	Powers	Wilson, La.
Dupré	Kahn	Price	Winslow
Egan	Kehoe	Purnell	Wise
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Ragdale	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Ralney	Woolyard
Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsayer	Zihlman
Elston	Kettner	Rayburn	
Extopinal	Key, Ohio	Reed	
Evans	Kinkaid	Roberts	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called, whereupon 179 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the list of absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] has a point of order pending.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on this section, in line 3, beginning with the word "for" and ending in line 5 with the semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. What page?

Mr. TAGUE. Page 121.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What part of the bill?

Mr. TAGUE. Page 121, lines 3 to 5.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To the whole paragraph?

Mr. TAGUE. No; ending with the figures, "\$4,000."

Mr. NORTON. On what does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman leaves in the maintenance of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle. The gentleman's point of order would strike out the automobile and leave in the maintenance.

Mr. TAGUE. I make the point of order to the whole section.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

After line 2 insert the following: "For purchase, exchange, and maintenance of horses and horse-drawn, passenger-carrying vehicles, purchase of a motor truck, repair of vehicles including motor trucks and harness, \$3,200."

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I want to ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us have the point of order determined, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NORTON. I make the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. NORTON. I make the point of order that that part providing for the purchase of a motor truck is new legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order for just one minute?

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us get it passed upon. If the point of order is to be made, let us get rid of it and get along with the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state that this provision has been carried in the bill heretofore. If gentlemen are going to deny to the department a motor truck, necessary to carry supplies from point to point, and similar facilities, I do not know how the department is going to operate. Now, it seems to me that the gentleman ought to take into consideration the fact that this department needs some vehicle of this kind.

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not aware that the Post Office Committee gave the Post Office Department \$400,000 for new automobiles?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And not a dollar of that sum can be expended in the District of Columbia, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman where the automobiles that are in the District will come from?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit? Not one dollar may be spent in the departmental service, but any amount can be spent in connection with the Postal Service in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true so far as the Postal Service is concerned, but not one dollar can be spent in connection with the departmental service.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield? I want to get some information. Does this provide—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the point of order.

Mr. NORTON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the bill provides that the money hereby appropriated for the maintenance of these motor trucks shall be used in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is so provided, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, in the bill later on. There is a provision to cover that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I insist on the motion. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 40.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I raise the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not, but the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations made for the service of the Post Office Department in conformity with the act of July 2, 1836, shall not be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Post Office Department at Washington, D. C.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has had to leave the Hall on account of illness, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1854, commonly known as the daylight-saving bill, may have a privileged status.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has had to leave the Hall on account of illness, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1854, commonly known as the daylight-saving bill, may have a privileged status.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the daylight-saving bill, so called, S. 1854, shall have a privileged status.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative amendments to H. R. 9390, a bill to promote the efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 968); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an increase of \$900,000 to the estimate of appropriation heretofore submitted for collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 969); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 372), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5351) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 373), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 171) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 374), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10658) to provide for the building and testing of the Slate gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10659) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United

States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 10660) to amend an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 10661) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Northeastern District of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10662) to authorize the judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals to be assigned to any district or circuit court of appeals of the United States and conferring the jurisdiction of said courts upon them while so assigned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of Federal building at Princeton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10664) to empower the Secretary of War to grant furloughs to enlisted men engaged in agriculture and other industries intimately related to winning the war for such periods as he may designate to engage in such industries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 10665) to establish a bureau for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 10691) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALDOW: Resolution (H. Res. 272) for the restoration of the rural mail routes in the county of Erie, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WELTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) providing for an increase of pay to the custodian employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 10666) for the relief of Johanna Dunton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10667) granting a pension to Thomas R. Poole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 10668) granting a pension to Georgia A. Colony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Wint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10670) granting a pension to Hattie M. Wescott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) granting a pension to Mary E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10672) granting a pension to Anna B. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10673) granting a pension to Kate M. Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10674) granting an increase of pension to William Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10675) granting an increase of pension to James H. Nale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting an increase of pension to John Linguist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 10677) granting an increase of pension to William W. Agee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to Henry Burcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10679) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 10680) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10681) granting a pension to Philip M. Earle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10682) granting a pension to Ellen E. Greenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10683) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 10684) granting a pension to Charles E. Keck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10685) granting a pension to Clarinda L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting an increase of pension to George A. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to Cora Fannie Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 10688) granting an increase of pension to John Pierstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10689) granting a pension to Alexander Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10690) granting an increase of pension to David F. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 10692) granting a pension to Patrick Macdonnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 10693) granting an increase of pension to Tony K. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of board of management, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petitions of Oakland Farmers' Club and other farm clubs of the State of Missouri, asking that the Government fix a price on meats and grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to perpetual Federal railroad control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Live Stock Shippers' Protective League, favoring continuing rates and charges under Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Manhattan Single-Tax Club, of New York, favoring 160 acres of land for men in the military and naval service of the country; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Joshua L. Bailey & Co., of New York, favoring passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Rev. Clarence L. Eaton, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., favoring the passage of H. R. 5407, for the admission of osteopathic physicians to examinations for commissions in the medical branch of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of council of the Chicago Medical Society, indorsing House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Federal Board of Farm Organizations, in reference to amendment of draft regulations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the North End Business Men's Association of Chicago, favoring increased compensation for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, for the Garland bill (H. R. 7364) to reincorporate the Loyal Order of Moose in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Sewing Machine Co., of Belvidere, Ill., that corporation income and excess taxes may be paid in quarterly installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the carpenters' convention of the State of Massachusetts, asking the Shipping Board to commandeer all shipyards doing Government work, and asking that the President provide equal representation of labor on all commissions dealing with labor problems; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution of the Lancaster Typographical Union, No. 70, urging the enactment of the old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of the Grace Lutheran Church and the Grace Baptist Church, of San Jose, Cal., urging immediate prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the board of governors of the Investment Bankers' Association of America, favoring the principle of the

war finance corporation bill and suggesting changes that should be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Letter from Denver Typographical Union, No. 49, indorsing Sherwood old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, letter from Colorado Prison Association, indorsing Senate bill 3076; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of T. D. Hetherington, William Honeyman, A. C. McGuire, Harold R. Smith, J. J. Ashenburt, Dr. O. W. Spicer, R. E. Cook, R. A. Arens, T. B. Johnson, George R. Crow, Percy Parker, William Stevens, and John A. Frazer, all of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Providence (R. I.) Medical Society, urging passage of Senate bill 3748 and House bill 9563, creating advance rank for officers of Medical Corps in United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Surry Lumber Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of Senate bill 5426, relative to President taking over timberlands and sawmills during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John J. Reitz, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 5531, relative to pharmacists in United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Maryland Association for the Prevention and Relief of Tuberculosis, favoring passage of House bill 9663, to manufacture war munitions in prison shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Anna Maria Thomas, Washington, D. C., favoring passage of the bill to retire Government clerks; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Railway Mail Association, third division, Baltimore Branch, urging increased pay for railway mail employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of William A. Marburg; Strouse & Bros.; William H. Whitridge; Armstrong, Cator & Co.; Sappington & Moffit; Gomprecht & Benesch, M. S. Levy & Sons (Inc.); William A. Dickey; Swindell Bros.; the Automobile Club of Maryland; and C. Thomas Kemp, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against House bill 8565, taxing automobiles \$25 per year; also, petitions of Joseph F. Hanselman, president of the Woodstock College, favoring House bill 9223 exempting educational legacies from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of 4,000 Socialist Party members in Minnesota protesting against 20 years court-martial sentence at Camp Dodge of Allan Broms, Morris Kamman, and six other conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers Local Union No. 205, Minneapolis, Minn., asking that Government ownership of railroads be given serious consideration at this time; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of Electrical Workers' Union No. 202, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that no time be fixed when the railroads shall be returned to private ownership, leaving the question for future determination; also requesting increased pay for Government employees; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists legislative committee, State of Minnesota, requesting no action be taken as to future date for returning railroads to private ownership, and asking a referendum on the question; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 9142, granting a pension to William E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Igloo No. 15, Pioneers of Alaska, asking for the development of the coal and oil resources of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAGUE: Resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State Council of Carpenters and Joiners of America, regarding the system of awarding contracts to shipbuilding concerns on the "cost-plus" basis; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions adopted by the bituminous operators committee of the Wholesale Coal Trade Association of New York, on the food bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.